

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is not always in the more elaborate articles of the *London Quarterly Review* that one finds the greatest interest. It is often in those informal contributions that are thrown together at the end. In the number for this present quarter there are estimable articles, carrying much weighty information, and written by men of the eminence of Professor FINDLAY, of Headingley College, Leeds. But the life of the *London Quarterly Review* this month lies in four short informal papers modestly hidden away under the general title of 'Notes and Discussions.'

One of these papers is called 'A New Way in Apologetics.' It gives an account of that recent movement in Germany which is known by the name of 'Evenings for Discussions on Religion' (Religiöse Diskussionsabende). Professor TASKER, of Handsworth College, Birmingham, who writes the note, makes no comparison between this movement and our own 'Pleasant Sunday Afternoons.' For the only thing common to them is the confession that the working-man will no longer come to the Church, and therefore the attempt must be made to take the Church to the working-man. But the easy hour in the afternoon, the cheerful solo singing, the short optimistic address, are far removed from those evenings of determined and protracted discussion, sometimes heated with outbursts of long-cherished hatred of

the Church of Christ, and always reaching to the very foundations of life and creed, which are taking place in Germany.

The 'Discussion Evenings,' says Dr. TASKER, were instituted neither as evangelistic agencies nor as aids to sectarian propagandism. They appeal to the artisan's delight in public discussions on topics of interest. Their success proves that religious questions still hold a foremost place among the subjects in which he is keenly interested, although he may be estranged from the Churches. A man of this type refuses invitations to listen to pulpit exhortations; and he is not attracted by æsthetic ceremonial. In short, his attitude of mind is such that he is most likely to be impressed by arguments brought forward in a fair discussion in which difficulties are frankly stated and as frankly faced.

The Discussion Evenings are not confined to working-men. In Berlin a monthly theological 'evening' is attended by the well-educated, and that to an average of six hundred persons. One of the elementary principles of the movement is that local conditions must be carefully considered. And so, in Saxony, where even the artisan will not attend, and no 'Discussion Evenings' can be held, visits are paid to the meetings of the labour societies, the working-men's clubs, and the

like, whenever suitable subjects are found on their programmes.

There is another paper in these Notes and Discussions which deserves attention. It is an encouragement to preachers to consider the science of Psychology.

For 'certainly,' says Professor Frederic PLATT, who writes the paper, 'psychology at present carries the honours among those studies, not distinctly professional, which contribute greatly to the preacher's success.'

'To the modern preacher,' continues Professor PLATT, 'the study of psychology is an imperative duty. The most spiritual member of his order has much to learn from it—and probably almost as much to unlearn. It defines and illuminates the processes of conviction, conversion, and sanctification which he aims to stimulate and guide; and even more, it defends these as essential human experiences for which the economy of mental development is prepared and expectant.'

How is it, then, that this study has suddenly become so imperative to the preacher? Some will answer, because it has been so cleverly and persistently boomed. Professor PLATT answers, because a complete revolution has taken place in the study of the mind. The ideals and methods of the Mental Philosophy of a quarter of a century ago have been forsaken. The study of the mind is no longer merely analytical and descriptive; it is experimental and organic. The fact that the new psychology is physiological, based on the correlation between mind and brain, is itself significant of the importance of the change.

There are certain spheres of inquiry and of knowledge which have already been illuminated with light thrown upon them by the processes and facts of psychology. Anthropology, folk-lore, the rise and growth of myth and magic, comparative ethics—all these and more look upon the results of psychological research as fundamental. Now

these spheres of inquiry or of knowledge form the very borderland of the realm of the preacher. Between them and the region of human life in which the preacher has his being, the partition, says Professor PLATT, is very thin. Psychology has itself broken down the partition. Within the last few years it has found a home where religion dwells. It now claims to be indispensable for the interpretation of religious experience to our generation.

It is a long time since the Gospels were first accused of being 'tendency' writings. And perhaps it is because evil communications corrupt good manners that we no longer resent the accusation. After all, we say, why should they not be written with a tendency? How could they help being written with a tendency? A tendency is just a purpose. And if St. John, for example, wrote his Gospel for the purpose of proving that Jesus was the Christ the Son of God, is he to be blamed for selecting his materials to suit his purpose? A writer in *The Biblical World* for May, the Rev. W. P. BRADLEY, Ph.D., believes that all the Gospels have a tendency. They differ in the degree of it. But he is sure that he can prove both the tendency and its variety.

He believes that he can prove it by means of the history of John the Baptist. He takes the Gospels in the order in which everybody takes them now: first, St. Mark; next, St. Matthew or St. Luke (it does not matter which); and then St. John. And he believes he can show that St. Mark relates the history of the Baptist in its most historical form; that St. Matthew and St. Luke 'improve' it for their special purpose; and that St. John 'improves' it most of all.

Mr. BRADLEY takes the statements in the Gospels about the Baptist separately. The first statement is that John the Baptist's ministry secured wide attention. This is altogether as we should have expected. Any one who came with news of the Messiah was sure of at least a hearing. Especially

was he sure of a hearing from the common people. For they had nothing to lose and everything to gain by the coming of the Messiah, who was to 'put down the mighty from their seats, and exalt them of low degree.' And John had, in addition, the ascetic appearance, the desert fare of carob beans and wild honey, the shaggy garments of camel's hide, and the leathern girdle holding them together. His supreme fearlessness was in his favour. His scorching rebuke reminded the people of Elijah, whose return Malachi had promised 'before the great and terrible day of the Lord.' With all these advantages the Baptist was sure to obtain a strong hold of the hearts of the common people.

And the first three Gospels unreservedly say that he did so. Why should they not? The Baptist was the harbinger of the Messiah. But the Fourth Gospel mentions neither multitudes nor preaching in connexion with the Baptist. 'We shall not be surprised at this,' says Mr. BRADLEY, 'after we proceed a little farther.'

The next statement is that the Baptist declared publicly and in strong language his own inferiority to the coming Messiah. And in this all the four Gospels agree. But St. Luke and St. John tell us that his declaration was really a disclaimer. St. Luke says that all men were reasoning in their hearts whether the Baptist was not himself the Messiah. When John heard of their 'reasoning' he uttered an indignant remonstrance.

But the account of the disclaimer is much more elaborate in the Fourth Gospel. It represents the reasoning of the people as greatly disturbing the hierarchy in Jerusalem, and declares that the latter appointed a special ecclesiastical committee and sent it down to take John's denial officially. Not only so. The denial in the Fourth Gospel is far more comprehensive than in the Synoptics. John declared that he was not the *Messiah*, nor *Elijah*, nor *that prophet* (like unto Moses), but only a voice, a witness to the Coming One.

Mr. BRADLEY draws particular attention to the Baptist's denial that he was Elijah. The Synoptists, he says, know nothing of it. On the contrary, St. Mark and St. Matthew tell us that John was the Elijah who was to come, and they give Jesus Himself as their authority. Mr. BRADLEY believes that it is all part of a deliberate purpose. The party of John the Baptist had a powerful influence while the Fourth Gospel was being written. It was to lessen that influence that the Evangelist withheld from John all official status other than that of a 'witness' to Jesus.

The third statement is that John did no miracle. Mr. BRADLEY sees no reason to deny it. But only the Fourth Gospel tells us so. That is to say, it is the Gospel which attaches the greatest weight to the 'signs' of Jesus that tells us John the Baptist did no sign.

The fourth statement is that John preached the baptism of repentance 'unto remission of sins.' It is the Synoptists that tell us this. What do they mean?

Do they mean that the ministry of John brought remission of sins independently of Jesus? If they do, Mr. BRADLEY is sure that they said so only under the pressure of an over-mastering force of tradition. But perhaps they mean only that John's preaching prepared the way for the remission of sins by Jesus. Mr. BRADLEY is sceptical. If that is all they mean, they take, he says, a curiously blind and inadequate way of expressing their meaning.

But in this case he sees progress in the tendency of the Gospels, progress in a tendency to push the Baptist into the background. St. Mark says that John preached repentance unto the remission of sins. St. Luke says the same in his Gospel, but refrains from it in the Acts. St. Matthew retains the confession of sins, but is silent as to their forgiveness. Last of all, the Fourth Gospel says nothing about either confession or forgiveness.

The only function which John's ministry retains apart from the witness to Jesus, is the baptism of water.

The next statement is that John recognized Jesus when He appeared, and gave testimony to His Messiahship. But who tells us this? Not St. Mark, and not St. Luke. And the silence of St. Mark and St. Luke is to Mr. BRADLEY astounding. For John was certainly considered the forerunner of Jesus by both these writers, and yet they do not mention that he recognized Jesus or proclaimed Him to be the Messiah. St. Matthew does tell us that John recognized Jesus and was reluctant to baptize Him. But the recognition was only private. It is not until we turn to the Fourth Gospel that we find the Baptist bearing testimony publicly and in unmistakable terms to the official dignity of Jesus. And so far, says Mr. BRADLEY, are the Synoptists from sharing this opinion with the Fourth Gospel, that they tell us that the last thing which John did was to send some of his disciples to Jesus to ask if He was the Messiah, or if the Messiah was yet to come.

The last statement is that John's disciples, some of them if not all, left him and attached themselves to Jesus. Again the statement is found in the Fourth Gospel, and in the Fourth Gospel only. According to the Synoptists, the disciples of John were with him even after Herod had put him in prison. And when he was beheaded they took up his body and buried it. They were quite friendly to Jesus, for they came and told Him of the death of John. But it is not said that even then they attached themselves to Him.

There is evidence, on the contrary, says Mr. BRADLEY, that after the death of the Baptist his disciples remained distinct and independent, and continued to 'look for another.' The evidence is found in the facts regarding Apollos and certain others at Ephesus.

Apollos belonged to Alexandria. Twenty years

after the Crucifixion he was still arguing mightily from the Old Testament Scriptures that the Messiah was coming (Acts 18²⁵). The exact words are: 'He taught accurately the things concerning Jesus.' But the sense of the whole passage makes it clear to Mr. BRADLEY that he taught accurately the things concerning the *Messiah*, and that it was not Apollos yet, but the writer of the Acts, for whom Jesus and the Messiah were synonymous terms. At any rate it is stated distinctly that he knew only the Baptism of John. Coming over to Ephesus to preach there also, he was convinced by Priscilla and Aquila that Jesus was the very Messiah whom he had been expecting and preaching. And from that time there is no abatement of power or eloquence. He crossed over to Corinth, and began truly to preach the things concerning Jesus.

Meantime St. Paul arrived in Ephesus. Here he found about twelve persons who were adherents of the faith of John the Baptist. There is no evidence that they had any connexion with Apollos, and Mr. BRADLEY thinks it is quite improbable. For if they had been converts of his they would certainly have heard from him about Jesus, and about the gifts of the Spirit, before he departed for Corinth. It is therefore evident that so late as the third missionary journey of Paul the followers of John the Baptist continued to form a distinct and widespread party.

Now Mr. BRADLEY does not say that the Fourth Gospel is guilty of deliberate misrepresentation when it states that certain followers of John the Baptist attached themselves to Jesus. But he says that at the time when the Fourth Gospel was written there was evidently a considerable party who knew nothing of John as the forerunner of Jesus, but revered him solely for his own sake; and that it was the interest of the Evangelist to show that even during the lifetime of John some at least of his followers acknowledged Jesus to be the promised Messiah and Saviour of the world.

'And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock, one shepherd' (Jn 10¹⁶).

What is there in this verse that is worth attending to? There is the change of 'fold' into 'flock' made by the Revisers in the end of it. And certainly that change is worth attending to. 'The translation *fold* for *flock*,' says WESTCOTT, 'has been most disastrous in idea and in influence.' But we know that now. All that remains for that is to acknowledge it in practice. Is there anything else in the verse?

There is nothing else. The commentators are unanimous that there is nothing else in this verse worth commenting on. 'Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold'—these are the Gentiles, they say. The Gentiles are outside the Jewish fold, and will never be brought within it. For the Jewish fold is to be broken down. When the Gentiles 'hear my voice,' they shall be brought, not within the Jewish fold, but into the Christian flock. There shall be one flock, Jews and Gentiles together and indistinguishably composing it, as there shall be one Shepherd. So say the commentators unanimously. Turn the second 'fold' into 'flock,' and they find no other difficulty.

But there are other difficulties. First of all there is the difficulty that our Lord is not accustomed to call any persons His sheep until they have believed on His name. Is there any example elsewhere of this name, or any name like this—believers, disciples, or any other—being applied to persons who have not yet become followers? And not only have these sheep, if they are Gentiles, not yet become followers; they have not yet heard of the existence of Jesus. The vast majority of them have not yet been born.

Then there is the difficulty of the words, 'I must bring.' WESTCOTT prefers 'I must lead,' and argues rather earnestly for it. But he did

not persuade the rest of the Revisers. For the words have a strong personal reference. This is evidently a duty which our Lord felt to be His own and to be urgent. 'I must work the works of him that sent me while it is day'; 'I must go on my way to-day and to-morrow and the day following'; 'Them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice.'

Now, when we appreciate the force of these difficulties, and then consider who these 'other sheep' may be, we remember that there are certain persons of whom our Lord used the very words which He uses here. 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead *shall hear the voice* of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live' (Jn 5²⁵).

The Rev. R. W. HARDEN, B.A., who is not a novice in the art of exposition, has written a small book on *The Gospel in Hades* (Combridge & Co.; 1s. net). The book is occupied chiefly with an interpretation of the famous passage about preaching to the spirits in prison. But this text in the Fourth Gospel is interpreted also. And Mr. HARDEN believes that its proper interpretation is to refer the 'fold' of the beginning of the verse to that Christian fold in which the disciples were safely sheltered as long as Jesus was upon the earth, the 'other sheep' to those who believed in God but passed away before the Incarnation, and then the 'flock' to that great multitude of saints, both of the old dispensation and of the new, who are gathering round the throne of God and of the Lamb.

If the period of the criticism of the Bible has come to an end, what has it done for us? If we have entered on the period of reconstruction, what form is the reconstruction likely to take? The editors of the *Biblical World* believe that they are able to answer that question. They give their answer in the issue for July, under the title of 'A New Type of Christianity.'

Their title is 'A New Type of Christianity.' It is not 'The Reconstructed Bible.' For they consider that the criticism of the Bible has never been an end in itself. Always, when it understood itself, it was a means towards a better knowledge of Christ. If we had a wholly new Bible, we should not necessarily be better Christians. Unless the criticism of the Bible has brought us nearer Christ, it has been in vain. What the editors of the *Biblical World* look forward to is properly and necessarily a new type of Christianity.

They do not mean, however, that the new type of Christianity which they look forward to will be cut off from the Christianity that has gone before. It is Christianity itself that is to become new. As the Apostle says, 'Old things have passed away, behold *they* have become new.' What they mean is that the old Christianity has of late been undergoing changes which are numerous enough and serious enough to entitle them to speak of the outcome as a new type of Christianity.

Accordingly, they proceed to enumerate the characteristics of the new type of Christianity that is at hand. One characteristic is 'its thoroughgoing acceptance of the maxim, "Whatsoever is true."'

But, surely, there is nothing new in that. Has any Christian generation, has any individual Christian, ever admitted that their supreme purpose was *not* the search for truth? The editors of the *Biblical World* are aware of it. And yet they hold to their claim. They believe that in the days that are at hand the truth will be sought with more disinterestedness, and embraced with more genuine affection than it has been—well, since the days of the Apostle Paul.

And they bring their belief to the test. If there is, let us say, a controversy between Geology and Genesis, the New Christianity will follow Geology: It will hold that the record left in the strata of

the earth cannot be impugned by a poet of the pre-scientific age, even though that poet be also a prophet of a higher conception of God than had before his day prevailed. If, again, there is a controversy between the records of history contained in the Books of Chronicles and those discovered on the Assyrian monuments, the statements of the Books of Chronicles will not be preferred to those of the monuments, although the religion of the Chronicler may be far better than that of the Assyrian stone-cutter.

Another characteristic of the new Christianity will be its insistence on character more than upon creed. It will recognize 'the possibility that an honest man may be in great perplexity on many questions of doctrine, and yet be sincerely and wholly devoted to the practice of the principles which Jesus taught and exemplified.' Hence it will welcome to its fellowship men of widely different types of theological belief or doubt, but it will exclude from its fellowship men of widely different moral purpose. Not that it will be without theology; nor that its theology will be a string of negatives. But it will lay the emphasis on those doctrines which make for character and conduct, not on those which offer scope for intellectual discussion.

A third characteristic of the new type of Christianity will be the emphasis it will lay upon *doing*. It will not be particular about agencies. Whatever agency is found most convenient and effective will be made use of, even though a member of the S.P.G. should have to work alongside a member of the L.M.S. Nor will it be careful to save the face of such ancient doctrinal favourites as the inherent depravity of man or the inherent badness of all non-Christian religions. Its aim will be to make Christianity Christian in spirit and in deed, and to cover the earth with it.

These are the leading characteristics of the Christianity that is about to come, these three. There is one thing left to be asked about it,

Will it be Christianity? It will be scientific; it will be ethical; it will be practical. Will it also be religious? If the new Christianity does not teach men to love their God with all their heart, in addition to, or rather in front of, loving their neighbour as themselves, it will not be Christianity.

The editors of the *Biblical World* believe that the struggle will be here. But they believe that the Christianity we are coming to, will insist upon the reality of the spiritual, and upon the necessity of fellowship between man and God.

The Present and the Future Kingdom in the Gospels.

BY PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., LL.D., PROFESSOR OF CLASSICAL ARCHÆOLOGY
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

EVERY student of the problems of the Gospels is aware that of late there has appeared in Germany, France, and England a strong tendency to lay great stress on the eschatological element in the Synoptic writings. For many years past the ordinary view of criticism had been that when Jesus proclaimed the Kingdom of God, He may in a measure have shared the views of His contemporaries that a mighty convulsion was at hand, but that His teaching in the main had to do with the present, and was ethical rather than apocalyptic; that the Kingdom of which He spoke was in the hearts of men, not waiting to be revealed in the skies. But Johannes Weiss, in his remarkable paper of 1892, asserted that the phrase 'Kingdom of God' was used by Jesus only in the eschatological sense, that for Him the Kingdom was not partly present and partly future, but wholly future and supernatural, a sudden catastrophe. Dr. Schweitzer carries further the view of Weiss. He also thinks that by Jesus the Kingdom of God was expected to come in a great catastrophe. He observes that the ethics of Jesus belong only to a time of expectation, their end is to make men free of the world, and ready to enter unimpeded into the Kingdom. When he uses the term 'Son of Man' he is thinking only of the exalted being spoken of in Daniel, who is to come in the clouds of heaven, and to whom is given dominion over all peoples. Passages in which the 'Kingdom of God' or the 'Son of Man' are spoken of in another sense are to be cleared away.

This rigorous and *a priori* method of criticism seems to Dr. Schweitzer the only criticism worthy of the name. He greatly rejoices over the epoch-making pamphlet of Weiss. 'At last,' he writes,

'there is an end of "qualifying clause" theology, of the "and yet," the "on the other hand," the "notwithstanding."' Weiss 'lays down the newest great alternative which the life of Jesus had to meet, *either* eschatological *or* non-eschatological. Progress always consists in taking one or other of two alternatives, in abandoning the attempt to combine them.'¹

Dr. Sanday, with his usual generous appreciation, has highly praised the treatise of Dr. Schweitzer. Learned it is, no doubt, and valuable as a record of the history of criticism, and clear, and full of up-to-date expressions. And beyond question, the man who consistently and clearly uses an extreme theory as a key to unlock historic problems does clear the air. He illumines men's minds, and makes them see whither arguments tend. On account of this merit we may pardon an extreme theorist a good deal of pedantry.

But, in compensation, systems of such extreme simplicity and logicity have drawbacks. They sometimes make up for the triumph of massacring *buts* and *notwithstandings*, and marching straight to their end, by outraging common sense, and constructing a house of cards, which, however fine to look at, will not resist a breath of wind. If their principle is faulty, their consistency only makes them the easier to refute.

The purely eschatological interpretation of the Synoptic teaching as set forth by Weiss and Schweitzer admits, I think, of a complete refutation. Such refutation one cannot, indeed, extract solely from a study of St. Mark's Gospel, because it is a document which may be interpreted in many ways, and stands at the end of a considerable

¹ *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, p. 237.

period of Christian development. To the end of time, probably, critics will differ as to many points in the life and teaching recorded in this Gospel. In the future, as in the past, every thoughtful reader will find in the Jesus of St. Mark a figure which will in some degree conform to his expectation.

But we have in the New Testament other documents of a less flexible temper. No serious critic doubts that in the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians we have the words of St. Paul. Here we may excavate the text with confident hope that we shall find treasure. We can learn with certainty what St. Paul said and thought. We ought to take our start from the Epistles, since in all science the right method is to proceed from the better known to the worse known. St. Paul uses the phrase 'Kingdom of God'; and his use of it furnishes a conclusive argument against the theories of Dr. Schweitzer. For what is actual in the mental attitude of St. Paul, cannot be ruled out as impossible in the thought of his Master.

That St. Paul expected a catastrophic return of his Master we are certain, since in two long passages he describes that return as he expects it. He thinks that the existing world is about to pass; that all human relations, such as marriage, are of a temporary character. Soon the Kingdom of God is to arrive; Jesus Christ is to reign in a spiritualized world, inhabited by the spiritual bodies of the Saints. Flesh and blood cannot dwell in that Kingdom, any more than can the unrighteous. But while the Kingdom of God is thus in the future, it is also in the present, and on the earth.

In St. Paul's writings, the phrase 'the Kingdom of God' does not often recur, but when it is used, it is as often regarded in the present tense as in the future. In Ro 14¹⁷ he writes: 'The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit.' Obviously here the Apostle is speaking of conduct in accord with the divine will. Eating and drinking, about which some Christians had scruples, are declared by him to be in themselves indifferent; what really matters is a life in the Spirit. And this life is one lived in the present on the earth. In 1 Co 4²⁰ St. Paul writes: 'The kingdom of God is not in word, but in power.' He is opposing those who with

boastful speeches have claimed to better his teaching: and he demands that the controversy between him and them shall be decided not by words, but by spiritual power, for it is in that that the life of the Church which is God's realm consists.

We find a similar view, though differently expressed, in a later Epistle, also generally regarded as Pauline, that to the Colossians (1¹³). Here the Apostle is speaking of the causes which the converts have for joy and thankfulness. The chief of these is that God delivered them out of the power of darkness, and translated them into the Kingdom of the Son of His love. Obviously, since this deliverance has already taken place, the Kingdom into which they are admitted cannot be in the future.

In these and other passages St. Paul evidently uses the phrase 'Kingdom of God' as equivalent to the Church of Christ. And so we cannot be surprised that usually in connexions in which his Master would have used the phrase, he uses the word 'the Church' instead. The Church is the reflexion and embodiment on earth of the divine Kingdom. In the Church the will of God is done, although not so fully as it is done in heaven.

In some instances it is almost impossible to say whether, in speaking of the Kingdom, St. Paul means the future realm or the existing society. For example, in 1 Thess 2¹² he bids the disciples behave in a manner worthy of their vocation, since God calls (or called) them to His own Kingdom and glory. It is not possible here to say with precision whether the Apostle is thinking of the calling as members of the Society, or as heirs of a future Kingdom. The present and the future are but two sides of a status of salvation to which Christians have attained.

Alas for St. Paul! He does not understand the conditions of German criticism! He weakly speaks of the Kingdom as future, and at the same time as present. He falls into the snare of *but* and *notwithstanding*. He even dares, in company with all the great leaders in the history of the world, to be inconsistent, and to direct his writings rather to the building up of a Church and the salvation of his hearers, than to the formulation of a thoroughly thought-out system of interdependent propositions.

But surely no serious student of the Pauline writings can for a moment doubt which was primary in St. Paul's thought, the present or the future. The future dwelt in the background of his mind, and doubtless often dominated his meditations, but it was the present state of the Church, its morality, its beliefs, its relation to the world around, which made the working purpose of his life. He was sane, and so practical; he was a missionary, and most eager to found on the visible earth the divine Kingdom for the good of which he lived. History shows that great mystics often have a depth of worldly wisdom which goes far beyond that of the men who do not see beneath the surface of things.

When we turn back from the Pauline Epistles to the words of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels, we find precisely the same confusion of present and future which we noted in St. Paul. The Kingdom of God is sometimes spoken of as future; as the rule to be established by the Messiah when He comes upon the clouds of heaven as the Judge of mankind. And much is said in St. Mark, though it does not all come from Jesus, as to the events which shall precede and give token of that coming. But in a far larger number of passages, as any one who uses a Concordance may see, the Kingdom is spoken of as present, as already existing beneath the surface of the visible, in the hearts and wills of men. 'The kingdom of God is like unto leaven'; 'The kingdom of God is within (or among) you'; 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.' Why should I repeat all these sayings, which are familiar to every child?

Jesus does not refer, as does St. Paul, to an existing society, but to an invisible spiritual Kingdom, in which God's will is done. The Gospel of the Kingdom is more fully developed in the First Gospel than in the Second; but in several passages in St. Mk. it is clearly proclaimed. In the parables recorded in Mk 4²⁶⁻³² we have the same idea which is so prominent in the Matthaean parables of a Kingdom growing up and spreading in the hearts of men. In Mk 12³⁴ when Jesus says to the scribe, 'Thou art not far from the kingdom of God,' it is not possible to consider the saying, if rightly reported, as referring to a future apocalyptic Kingdom, of the time of which the speaker is not Himself aware; it must refer to a present and spiritual

realm beneath the surface of the visible. In Mk 10¹² the saying, 'Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein,' must refer to a Kingdom into which men can enter by a disposition of intention and of life, not to one into which they may at some future time find entrance. The mixture of present and future in the Marcan teaching of Jesus exactly corresponds to that in the Pauline Epistles, although in the one case the Kingdom is invisible, in the other it has become in a certain measure visible.

But Dr. Schweitzer proceeds, with utmost vigour and rigour, to rule out or to reinterpret these words. Either they are wrongly reported, or they are misinterpreted, or they belong to post-resurrection times. Have we not the right to ask him, before he lops the luxuriant branches of the Gospels into the closely cropped trees of a Dutch garden, to try his thesis on the Pauline Epistles? The disciple believed in the approaching end of the world, but he at the same time believed in a present and inward divine Kingdom. What right have we to assume that the Master did not do the same, that to Him the Kingdom was not in two tenses? Jesus was a prophet; and to the Jewish prophets the future and the present were inextricably mingled. Through the present they saw the future, and the future lay already determined beneath the surface of the present. Their minds were not mapped out as rigidly as the system of the modern theologian would desire. Dr. Schweitzer accuses the great contemporary theologians of Germany, Bousset and Wernle and Harnack and the rest, of importing into the life of Jesus the ideas of modern Protestantism. To read the past in the light of the present is a tendency that none of us can wholly escape. But there could scarcely be found a more extreme example of yielding to that tendency than is furnished by Dr. Schweitzer, when he demands of the Founder of Christianity a logical precision of thought utterly foreign to His age and country. To adopt a striking phrase of Dr. Schechter, 'Whatever the faults of the Rabbis were, consistency was not one of them.' From the earliest days to our own they seldom clearly distinguish the present from the future Kingdom.

The question whether the primacy in the teaching and life of Jesus belongs to the practical

or the apocalyptic side of His beliefs is no doubt a matter as to which various opinions may be held. I am altogether on the side of those who regard the apocalyptic side as comparatively unessential, though I am aware that much may be

urged to the contrary. But to assert, as does Dr. Schweitzer, that it is a question of *either—or*, and that the apocalyptic side of the teaching is the only side, seems to me a quite unmaintainable theory in the face of St. Paul's Epistles.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

PSALM I. 3.

'And he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water,
That bringeth forth its fruit in its season,
Whose leaf also doth not wither;
And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.'

THE subject of the First Psalm is the advantage of being good. And that in this life. In the First Psalm, as in all the Old Testament, God is a rewarder, even here, of them that diligently seek Him. It is well with the righteous, it is ill with the wicked, now, in this life. The evidence was not always on the surface. A superficial view of the world told against the doctrine rather than in its favour. And the Psalmists were not always superior to the temptation of counting the proud happy. Yet it was experience that originally taught them that the lot of the righteous was better than the lot of the wicked; and an enlarged experience, confirmed by faith in God, always brought them back to that conviction. The First Psalm is a good introduction to the whole Psalter.

The Psalm is divided into two parts, each of three verses. The first part describes the righteous man and his lot; the second, the character and lot of the wicked man. The good man is first described negatively, in contrast to the bad man. He does not walk in the counsel of the wicked, nor stand in the way of sinners, nor sit in the seat of the scornful. In the second verse he is described positively, and by himself. He is one who delights in the law of the Lord and meditates in it day and night. Then, in the third verse, the writer rises to the height of his great argument, and in a passage of singular beauty describes what God has laid up in store for him that loves Him and keeps His commandments. *First*, he shall

reach the perfection of his being, the completeness of that life which is his—'he shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water.' *Next*, he shall accomplish the service for which he has been prepared, using appropriately and beneficently the gifts which God has given him—'that bringeth forth its fruit in its season.' *Thirdly*, he shall enjoy a perpetual freshness and interest in life—'whose leaf also doth not wither.' And *fourthly*, all his actions will be crowned with success—'whatsoever he doeth shall prosper'; or if we take the marginal reading, 'in whatsoever he doeth he shall prosper,' everything will work together for his good. The meaning is really the same.

I.

FULNESS OF LIFE.

'He shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water.'

To the Psalmist the life of devotion to the good was in no wise a thing of gloom; it was the only life that was rich and full as life could be. To delight in the law of the Lord did not mean that the nature was starved, deprived of its heritage, despoiled of the bloom and beauty whereby it ought to be adorned: consecration to holy things brought no emptiness, no dulling of life's brightness, no toning down of its joy: the man of spirituality was not left standing like some worn and scarred tree whose day of fruitfulness and grace was for ever gone by; he possessed, rather, the secret of perpetual youth and unfailing strength and undying gladness. He should be like a tree planted by the streams of water, that bringeth forth its fruit in its season: upon him there should descend no barrenness of winter; but in him, and upon

him, there should always rest the sweetness and beauty of spring.¹

It is one of the charges frequently cast against religion that it belittles human nature too much, and makes man feel that in this world he is hardly of any account at all; and religion treats man, they say, as if he were a rotten bough which deserves to be lopped off, and is only spared by the forbearance of the husbandman, rather than as a tree which brings forth its fruit in its season. And that in the truly consecrated life there will be, and must be, a consciousness of failure and a shamed realization that often and often the husbandman has come seeking fruit and finding none, is, of course, one of the elementary common-places of religious truth. But there is another side which is not to be ignored; and if in the consecrated life there comes first of all the sense that we are worth nothing, there should come next the sense that we are worth something, because through our consecration we become witnesses to and influences on behalf of the supreme thing, the best thing, in all the world. Delighting ourselves in the law of the Lord, we stand now for that which is dearest to God; and to do that is to make life great and to give life a worthy place.²

Among the many images under which the good man is described in Holy Scripture, perhaps there is none more vivid, says Newman, more beautiful, and more touching than that which represents him as some favoured and thriving tree in the garden of God's planting. Our original birthplace and home was a garden; and the trees which Adam had to dress and keep, both in themselves and by the sort of attention they demanded, reminded him of the peaceful happy duties and the innocent enjoyments which were the business of his life. A garden in its perennial freshness and its soothing calm is the best type of heaven, and its separate plants and flowers are the exactest types of its blessed inhabitants. Accordingly it is introduced into the last page of Scripture as well as into the first; it makes its appearance at the conclusion of man's eventful history as in the record of its opening. As in the beginning we read of the Paradise of pleasure, with the great river and its four separate streams, with all manner of trees, fair to behold and pleasant to eat of, and, above all, the Tree of Life—so, in the last chapter of the Apocalypse, we are told of the river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding from the throne of God and of the Lamb, which he that thirsteth may drink freely; and of the Tree of Life, bearing twelve fruits, the leaves of which were for the healing of the nations.³

The reference is clearly to the date-palm, one of the most important and valuable fruit-trees of these regions. It has frequently been suggested that it is the lovely oleander, 'the willows by the watercourses,' which screen, with their perennial shade, every river and brooklet in the land, and for weeks, in the early summer, shed a glowing sheet of pink over the fringe of every watercourse. But the oleander does not meet the conditions of this comparison; it is not planted, but indigenous, and it bears no fruit. The date-palm alone meets all requirements. Though it will grow in almost any soil, it will never bear fruit unless within reach of water; and as it is a dioecious tree, with the stamens and pistils on different plants, it very rarely yields fruit except under human care. It is true, one often sees palm groves where there is no apparent sign of water, in the most barren deserts. But the wandering Arab knows well that, wherever he sees a palm tree, he has but to probe deep enough to find water below.⁴

In order that the palm tree may attain the perfection of a palm tree, it has to be planted by the streams of water. In order that a man may reach the height of his manhood, he must surrender himself to God, who will appoint him his place and bring him his nourishment.

I. A TREE PLANTED.—It did not plant itself. It surrendered itself wholly and utterly to the husbandman. He took it in hand and dealt with it, and that was the beginning of its prosperity. This utter and whole-hearted surrender of ourselves is the first step in the blessed life. The Husbandman must have possession before he can do any planting. Let us see this very plainly. The difference between those who are the Lord's and those who are not, is not that some are born religious; it is not that some have been brought up in the midst of religious influences; it is not that some people believe certain theories and creeds, and others either do not understand them or do not think about them. It is not a matter of understanding. The religious life is a matter of *will*, of *choice*, of *surrender* to God.⁵

It is not the tree, but the planting and the place, that constitute the blessedness. So, then, do not let us think that we are the wrong sort. I have seen, in old-fashioned gardens, trees that have been cut and hacked and twisted into all sorts of fantastic shapes: peacocks and pagodas, and I know not what else. Alas for the trees that think they must be turned into peacocks before they can prosper! There are two kinds of religious people in the world: there are those who always want to be somebody else, and there are those who want everybody else to be exactly like themselves. Now, the woods need all the kinds of trees that

¹ H. W. Clark, *Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, 44.

² H. W. Clark, *ibid.* 49.

³ J. H. Newman, *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions*, 243.

⁴ H. B. Tristram, in *S.S. Times*, 19th March 1892, p. 185.

⁵ M. G. Pearse, *The God of our Pleasures*, 71.

God has made; and the world wants all the kinds of people that God has sent into it. Some people are, perhaps, very different from what God made them, but He wants us to be every one after his kind. As I walked through the woods the other day, I thought within myself how it would spoil everything if there sprang up a quarrel as to which was the *right* kind of tree. If the poplar contended proudly that everybody should stand upright, and make the most of himself; and the birch said it was a sign of grace to bend one's self on the earth, and told the poplar not to be so stiff! If the hawthorn sneered at the holly because it had its winter suit still; and the holly put up all its prickles and said, If it remembered rightly, the hawthorn had no winter suit to boast of. No, no; they mingle together, and each lends the other a new beauty, and the variety is the charm and play of the whole. The Heavenly Father made them all, and ministers to them all, and has a purpose for them all.¹

'Those that are planted in the house of the Lord shall flourish in the courts of our God.' It is the triumph of faith when we are brought to see how God not only provides but applies everything necessary for the perfection of man's salvation; and when, looking out of ourselves, we can discern a covenant 'well ordered and sure,' to the terms of which He has bound Himself. He 'cannot lie'; and the believer feels that, accepting salvation on His terms, he is not only reclining in the arms of boundless love, but is firmly resting on the Rock of eternal truth. It is well that God does all; it is our 'strong consolation.'

I was looking the other day at a tree that stood tall and flourishing, a perfect picture, and my friend told me that he had stuck a piece of stick in the ground and looked after it. 'And now,' he said, 'it has come to that.'²

Dr. John Paton, speaking of Namakei, his first convert on the island of Aniwa, says: 'He went in and out with intense joy. When he heard of the prosperity of the Lord's work, and how island after island was learning to sing the praise of Jesus, his heart glowed, and he said, "Missi, I am lifting up my head like a tree; I am growing tall with joy."'

2. BY THE STREAMS.—There is not only the rock to hold on to, but there is the river to refresh it. Rock and river, river and rock, this is what the law of God becomes. They who do not know think the law of God is hard and stern as the voice of thunder, with its *Thou shalt*. But they who do know cry, 'Great peace have they that keep Thy law.' It is rivers of water, sweet, refreshing, quickening. We think of the law as a command, but we come to find it a promise. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.' The word awes me, frightens me, withers me. But lo!

as the Blessed Lord comes on His way He speaks: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart.' It is not a command, but a promise, a pledge, and the very word brings the fulfilment.

There is a celebrated vine at Hampton Court that for many years disappointed the gardener's hopes. It was quite healthy, but there were few grapes. One year, however, it was unexpectedly laden with clusters of the finest fruit. Seeking to discover the cause of this, the gardener laid bare its roots, traced their ramifications, and found that they had suddenly gone through the banks into the Thames. It had 'sent forth its roots to the river,' and thenceforth ceased not from yielding fruit in richest abundance.

II.

SEASONABLE FRUITFULNESS.

'That bringeth forth its fruit in its season.'

This tree planted by the streams of water does not stand there for naught: it brings forth fruit in its season. Not only does it realize itself: it fulfils a worthy use.³

Every righteous life must end in fruit. The greenness and the beauty are but a form of promise. The inexorable condition on which life is given is that it should reach forward to fruit-bearing. He bore His fruit—in due season God fixed, and He still fixes, the season. The long tarrying in Nazareth, the brief ministry, the early and cruel death, the short sleep in the grave—all of them were timed and planned by the Eternal Wisdom and Love.⁴

If we would really bring before us what is both the highest blessedness in God's service, and also, in fact, the ordinary portion of good men, we shall find it to consist in what from its very nature cannot make much show in history,—in a life barren of great events, and rich in small ones; in a life of routine duties, of happy obscurity and inward peace, of an orderly dispensing of good to others who come within their influence, morning and evening, of a growth and blossoming and bearing fruit in the house of God, and of a blessed death in the presence of their brethren. Such has been the round of days of many a pastor up and down Christendom, as even history has recorded, of many a missionary, of many a monk, of many a religious woman, of many a father or mother of a family, of many a student in sacred or profane

¹ M. G. Pearse, *The God of our Pleasures*, 67.

² M. G. Pearse, *ibid.* 70.

³ H. W. Clark, *Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, 49.

⁴ W. Robertson Nicoll, *The Garden of Nuts*, 119.

literature,—each the centre of his own circle, and the teacher of his own people, though more or less unknown to the world.¹

I live for those who love me,
For those who know me true;
For the heaven that smiles above me,
And awaits my spirit, too;
For the cause that lacks assistance,
For the wrong that needs resistance,
For the future in the distance,
And the good that I can do.

III.

PERPETUAL FRESHNESS.

‘Whose leaf also doth not wither.’

The leaf is the thing of the spring-time. It is the first thing that comes. How soon it loses its delightful freshness! How soon the sweet greenness passes into the darker shades of summer, and becomes sere and yellow in the older days of autumn! But my text speaks of a religious life whose leaf shall retain its freshness through all the changing days. The spring glory shall not wither as the years roll away. The beauties of the spring-time shall continue through all the seventy years. The characteristic charms of childhood shall never be destroyed. Life shall grow. It shall increase in knowledge. It shall broaden in experience. It shall open out large capacities and powers. But amid all the many and varied developments the beauties of childhood shall remain. ‘His leaf shall not wither.’²

It is an evergreen, in which, while the leaves do fade and fall away, according to the universal law of life, they do so without being marked; in which there is no long interval of winter desolation, but a constant succession of foliage, keeping the tree always fresh and green. The leaf of the tree belongs to the tree itself. It is the part that is peculiar to its individual life. By it the tree breathes and forms its wood from air and sunshine. It is its strength, it is *itself*; for the whole tree is simply a modification and development of the leaf, as it is most certainly the creation of the leaf. The leaf, therefore, represents the righteous man’s own life. Not only does he do good to others by self-sacrificing labours, and thus keep up the general blessedness of the world, but he gets good to

himself. His own life is blessed. Nothing can keep the heart fresh and young and joyful amid the cares and changes of life like the godliness which is to a man’s nature what sunlight is to a plant.³

What are the leaves which make childhood so beautiful? They are these—hope and sympathy. These are the fresh green adornments of the spring-time of life. How many of us lose them as life passes forward into its prime. That is a wonderful word in the Apocalypse, wherein we are told that ‘the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.’ If ever the wounds and sorrows of the world are to be healed, it will have to be by the leaves of the tree of life, the green leaves of the spring-time, the leaves of hope and sympathy. It is the child-like disposition which is to heal the world’s broken heart.⁴

There are some who by their pursuit of holy things seem to be made the most crabbed and unlovely people on the face of the earth. And still the Psalmist’s doctrine may stand. If our professed delight in the law of the Lord does not make us like trees planted by the streams of water, we had better look to see whether there be not something wrong with our professed delight. Take it as a truth—devotion to goodness keeps the heart young. Consecration brings the joy of constant freshness upon heart and life.⁵

There are four seasons in thy spiritual year—the winter of desolation; the buds of spring, which tell of hope; the warmth of summer, which speaks the fulness of the heart; and the ingathering of autumn, which is the time for life’s practical fruits. Each season has its fruit, and the fruit is in its turn golden. Do not seek to change the order of God’s spiritual year; do not seek to put the fruits of one season into the lap of another. Thou must not expect the buds of spring from the desolation of winter, for desolation is the fruit of winter; thou, like Nicodemus, must begin thy journey in the sense of night—night without a star. Thou must not expect the warmth of summer from the buds of spring, for the fruit of spring is not fruition but hope; thou, like Peter, must be content for a time to live on aspiration alone. Thou must not expect the practical ingathering of autumn from the warmth of summer, for the fruit of summer is not action but emotion;

¹ J. H. Newman, *Sermons Preached on Various Occasions*, 246.

² J. H. Jowett, *Meditations for Quiet Moments*, 120.

³ H. Macmillan, *Two Worlds are Ours*, 207.

⁴ J. H. Jowett, *ibid.* 121.

⁵ H. W. Clark, *Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, 48.

thou, like John, must be content to lie on the Master's bosom until thy time to work for Him shall come.¹

A few days ago I called to see an old Christian who, too, is waiting for her translation, having nearly reached her ninetieth year. To her, life, as seen from the hilltop in the glory of the setting sun, seems a wondrous and beautiful thing, as indeed it is when it has been lived in loving service for God and man; and she has no word of complaint, but only of praise and thanksgiving to God. Across every page of her life-story she says there is written in letters of light, 'goodness and mercy.' Trials, yes, she has had them, but these have made the longing for the homeland deeper. Pain, yes, the old body suffers sometimes, day and night, but she can still sing 'Rock of Ages,' and 'I know that my Redeemer lives,' and it helps her when the hours are long and the nights are dreary. Like Billy Bray, the Lord has given her vinegar with a spoon, and honey with a ladle. And just when she was mourning that she could do nothing more for her Lord but just *be* a Christian in thought and deed, He graciously gave her something to fill up the measure of her days. A little grandchild came into her life, and in all this city there is no more beautiful sight than the old white-haired saint and the golden-haired child bending over the big Bible and looking at the pictures, while the grandmother tells stories which never lose their charm—of Joseph and Moses, and Daniel, and the Christ-Child, for whom the world had no better cradle than a manger. And her cup of joy is full to the brim, and all she can say is, 'Bless the Lord, O my soul.'²

'Whose leaf doth not wither.'

Never a heart, O God,
Grown sere and old,
Its streams of passion and of pain all spent,
Its tale all told;
Never an empty heart,
All ivied o'er,—
But one made wise to love and to be loved
More and yet more.
No withered winter tree,
Sapless and bare,
Lifting its leafless arms from the lone moor
To the bleak air,—
But planted, Lord, within
Thy Holy Place,
To strike new roots each day in the rich soil,
And grow in grace.

IV.

UNFAILING PROSPERITY.

'And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.'

The Jewish doctrine of retribution expressed in

¹ G. Matheson, *Moments on the Mount*, 79.

² S. Horton, *Christian World Pulpit*, lxx. 116.

the psalm is, according to our ideas, too superficial: we cannot believe that piety and external welfare always go together. Yet this doctrine is founded on a fundamental conviction of all higher religion—the conviction that piety must bear fruit, and that religion is not merely a subjective experience—rather that the pious man receives God's blessing and guidance.³

1. If we judge human life fairly and according to our best convictions, we shall probably come to a conclusion similar to that of the Psalmist, and even identical with it, though we may not express it in so absolute and unqualified a form. We see many exceptions, or many apparent exceptions, to the rule, but still we do hold it for a rule of life, that goodness thrives and reaches a good end, while badness languishes, tends to, and actually comes to, a bad end. By neither path, perhaps, do men reach their end *at once*, or soon. The ungodly, the sinner, and the scorner may swagger by us, and, with the world, the flesh, and the devil to help them, they may make a brave show for a time; but if we watch them carefully, we shall see their 'way' perishing behind and even under their feet, so that they cannot hark back even when they see the place of their torment before them, and can only with great labour and peril climb up into some better way. And, for a time, the good man, as he sits meditating on the law of the Lord, or delights to do His will with busy hand and eager foot, may see the world go by him, or hear its laugh of contempt, and feel lonely, hurt, forsaken. But has he lost so very much in losing the company, the smile and approval, of the world? Others grow rich, he keeps poor; others win reputation, he remains unknown; but if his character has been really formed by the Law in which he studies and delights, if in these brief hours of time he has really laid hold on eternal life, if he can smile at Fortune and her wheel because all changes, whether adverse or prosperous, bring him nearer to God, is he very much to be pitied for his loss? *What* has he lost after all? He has lost 'the chaff,' which is the sport of every wind, and which at last the wind of death must carry away. What has he gained? He has gained a place by that stream of living waters which carries life, fertility, fruitfulness, wherever it flows. The man who is sincerely

³ H. Gunkel, in *The Biblical World*, February 1903, p. 123.

good grows ever better, while the man who is really bad grows ever worse. Goodness tends to *life* in its highest sense; and badness to *death* in its saddest sense.¹

God does *actually*, though not completely, *make men blessed here*. Our text sums up the experience of all the devout hearts and lives whose emotions are expressed in the Psalms. He who wrote this Psalm would preface the whole by words into which the spirit of the book is distilled. It will have much to say of sorrow and pain. It will touch many a low note of wailing and of grief. There will be complaints and penitence, and sighs almost of despair before it closes. But this which he puts first is the keynote of the whole. So it is in our histories. They will run through many a dark and desert place. We shall have bitterness and trials in abundance, there will be many an hour of sadness caused by our own evil, and many a hard struggle with it. But high above all these mists and clouds will rise the hope that seeks the skies, and deep beneath all the surface agitations of storms and currents there will be the unmoved stillness of the central ocean of peace in our hearts. In the 'valley of weeping' we may still be 'blessed' if 'the ways' are in our hearts, and if we make of the very tears 'a well,' drawing refreshment from the very trials. With all its sorrows and pains, its fightings and fears, its tribulations in the world, and its chastenings from a father's hand, the life of a Christian is a happy life, and the joy of the Lord remains with His servants.²

2. Take the marginal reading, and you get at the essence of the idea. 'In whatsoever he doeth he shall prosper'—whatever may be the precise external result of his doing, *he himself* shall get something out of it, and be the more prosperous in soul. Not that to the man who delights in the law of the Lord the failures and distresses of other men do not come—not that they are for the devoted man magically changed somehow, so that failures and distresses are in themselves something different for him from what they are for anybody else, though that is sometimes made out to be God's promise, which it is not—but that through all the failures and distresses, his fate, because he

has linked it with holiness, remains unaffected and untouched. He prospers in all he does, because in truth he does but one thing. His life, being wrapped up in that which is good, goes on its way deeper and deeper into the good whatever may betide. The interest in which he is bound up is not to be touched by the things which happen in the outward world. He is safe, because temporal loss cannot diminish spiritual treasure. In whatsoever he doeth he shall prosper.³

A man is worth what he is, not what he has; and that is true both of this world, and of that which is to come. While he lives, he may win and lose everything but one—his own personality. That is always his; ultimately it is all that is his. In that lies his worth, if he have any; not in the abundance of the things which he possesses and can lose. And when he dies he loses what he has, but he remains what he is. He who is unjust will be unjust still; he who is holy will be holy still; but he who is wealthy, will be wealthy no more. It is a painful tribute to the commercialism of our age that a rich man is said to be worth so much when he dies. If he is worth no more than what he left, he is worth nothing; and in the other world, which, with all his foresight, he has forgotten or ignored, he will start a bankrupt if he start at all.⁴

Of all the sermons that I ever heard, says the Rev. Samuel Chadwick, the one which made the profoundest impression on me I heard when I was not more than ten years of age. Samuel Coley was the preacher. I was a little chap in a big chapel at the back of the gallery. He quoted the First Psalm. When he came to the sentence, 'And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper,' he said, 'It is not what he thinks he will do, not what he hopes, and is going to do, not what he half does, not what he does ten minutes too late, but whatsoever he doeth promptly and thoroughly and heartily, and with both hands, to the Lord, it shall prosper.'

The wind that blows can never kill
The tree God plants;
It bloweth east, it bloweth west,
The tender leaves have little rest,
But any wind that blows is best.

The tree God plants
Strikes deeper root, grows higher still,
Spreads wider boughs, for God's goodwill
Meets all its wants.

¹ S. Cox, in *The Expositor*, 2nd ser. i. 95.

² A. Maclaren, *Sermons Preached in Manchester*, 3rd ser. 232.

³ H. W. Clark, *Laws of the Inner Kingdom*, 55.

⁴ J. E. McFadyen, *The Divine Pursuit*, 41.

The Visibility of our Lord's Resurrection Body.

BY THE REV. J. M. SHAW, M.A., LOGIEPERT.

I.

THAT the disciples believed their crucified Lord had appeared to them after His death, not in visional or apparitional, but in real bodily presence, and that to this belief was due as a matter of history the rise of the Christian Gospel and the Christian Church—these are facts now admitted by practically all critics. The validity of this belief, however, is still in some quarters impugned on the ground of the historical untrustworthiness of the evidence for the supposed appearances. The untrustworthiness alleged is twofold. *First*: The various narratives on examination reveal 'discrepancies' or 'contradictions' in the reports of the appearances. Reimarus, the Wolfenbüttel Fragmentist, writing nearly a century and a half ago, enumerated ten such irreconcilable 'contradictions'—chiefly in regard to the locality of the appearances. 'In reality,' says a recent critic,¹ 'the number is much greater.' *Second*: Even if the evidence adduced be allowed, it is insufficient. It is not of a kind to satisfy the demands of scientific historical inquiry, inasmuch as the appearances recorded were all vouchsafed to interested parties, namely, to believers.

It is with the latter criticism that this paper is concerned. Let us have before us some representative statements of the objection.

It occurs already in the earliest reasoned criticism of Christianity that has come down to us—the *True Word* of Celsus, written about the end of the second century.² 'After these points,' says Origen, taking up Celsus's objections one by one, 'Celsus proceeds to bring against the gospel narratives a charge which is not lightly to be passed over, namely, that if Jesus desired to convince men that He was really divine, He ought to have appeared to those who had ill-treated Him, and to him who had condemned Him, and to men generally.'³

¹ Schmiedel in *Ency. Biblica*, iv. col. 4041.

² Keim dates it at 177 or 178 A.D.

³ Origen *Contra Celsum*, ii. 63: Μετὰ ταῦτα ὁ Κέλσος οὐκ εὐκαταφρονήτως τὰ γεγραμμένα κακολογῶν, φησὶν, ὅτι ἐχρῆν, εἴπερ ὅντως θεῖαν δύναμιν ἐκφῆναι ἠθέλην ὁ Ἰησοῦς αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἐπιηρέασαι καὶ τῷ καταδικάσαντι καὶ ὄλως πᾶν ὁφθῆναι.

The objection thus concisely stated by the shrewd pagan philosopher has found frequent expression, under varying forms, in modern times. Two instances may suffice. 'Secure evidence of the resurrection of Jesus,' says Strauss, 'would be the attestation of it in a decided and accordant manner by impartial witnesses. . . . But . . . Jesus showed himself to his adherents only: why not also to his enemies, that they too might be convinced, and that by their testimony posterity might be precluded from every conjecture of a designed fraud on the part of his disciples?'⁴

To like purpose Renan criticizes the N.T. accounts of the appearances as not satisfying 'scientific conditions,' or 'rational principles.' 'None of the miracles (of Evangelic history) took place under scientific conditions,' he says; and forthwith proceeds to state what conditions would satisfy 'scientific,' or 'rational' requirements. 'If to-morrow a thaumaturgus present himself with credentials sufficiently important to be discussed, and announce himself as able, say, to raise the dead; what would be done? A commission, composed of physiologists, physicists, chemists, persons accustomed to historical criticism, would be named. This commission would choose a corpse, would assure itself that the death was real, would select the room in which the experiment should be made, would arrange the whole system of precautions, so as to leave no chance of doubt. If, under such conditions, the resurrection were effected, 'a probability almost equal to certainty would be established'—a probability which would become certainty, 'if the miracle succeeded each time' it was tried.⁵

II.

Now the fact to which these criticisms refer, namely, the restriction of the recorded bodily manifestations of the risen Jesus, is a fact not only supported by the consistent testimony of the Evangelic accounts, but explicitly proclaimed by the Apostles. 'Him,' says Peter, 'God raised on the third day, and gave to become visible (καὶ

⁴ Strauss's *Life of Jesus*, Part iii. chap. 4, § 140.

⁵ Renan's *Life of Jesus*, Introduction, pp. 29-30 (Trübner).

ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐμφανῆ γενέσθαι), not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God, even unto us who did eat and drink with Him after He rose from the dead' (Ac 10⁴⁰⁻⁴¹). Was this restriction to believers arbitrary or accidental, or did it result naturally or necessarily from the character of the Lord's risen body? This is the question we wish to ask.

That the risen body was identical or continuous with the body that suffered on the Cross, the Evangelists' accounts bear witness. Apart from the fact of the empty grave, the identity or continuity was evidenced by the print of the nails and the spear mark in the side. It was still a body capable, like the earthly body, of being made tangible and visible (Lk 24^{39, 40}, Jn 20²⁰), and also of partaking of food (Lk 24⁴¹⁻⁴³). But it was the difference or contrast between the two that impressed the disciples most. Indeed, so great was the difference between the *risen* body and the natural that the Lord is represented as with difficulty persuading them of the identity of the two. In the case of the risen body, some at least of the former earthly conditions were transcended. Matter was no longer an obstacle. The risen Christ could pass through a closed sepulchre (implied by Mt 28²), and through shut doors (Jn 20^{19, 26}). He could be present in different and distant places at short intervals (Lk 24^{15, 34}). Suddenly He appears—without apparent physical locomotion,—and as suddenly He disappears (Lk 24^{31, 36}, Jn 20^{19, 26}). As regards the outward appearance, in particular, so utter was the change that, it would seem, the mere external form and features failed to disclose who He was. Mary Magdalene mistook Him for the gardener (Jn 20^{14, 15}). The two men on the way to Emmaus took Him for a stranger, and went on to tell Him what had happened recently in Jerusalem (Lk 24¹⁶). And at the Lake of Galilee, when Jesus stood on the beach, the disciples failed to recognize Him. This non-recognition is the more striking when we consider—(1) that, as Orr points out, 'the appearances were not momentary glimpses, but, at least in several of the cases, prolonged interviews';¹ and (2) that even when He appeared to the same people a second or a third time they still at first had their doubts as to His identity (Mt 28¹⁷, Lk 24³⁶⁻⁴³, Jn 19²⁴⁻²⁹ 20¹⁹⁻²³ 21⁴).

What was the cause of this inability to recog-

¹ *Expositor*, September 1908, p. 248.

nize the risen Lord on the part of those with whom He had held on earth familiar intercourse?

May it have been, as some have suggested, in the case of Mary, her sudden surprise and bewilderment, combined with the dimness of her tear-bedewed eyes? Did the two men on the way to Emmaus fail to recognize Him because of mental preoccupation with their grief. Again, in the incident at the Lake, may the disciples have been hindered from knowing Him by the distance, or by the dimness of the dawn? It is quite possible that surprise, bewilderment, grief, and such like subjective conditions may have been at work. But the narratives imply that there was something more in the case than this; that there was something in Christ's bodily appearance which prevented recognition, or at least assisted non-recognition. Luke says 'their eyes were holder that they should not know Him' (Lk 24¹⁶: οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ αὐτῶν ἐκρατοῦντο τοῦ μὴ ἐπιγινῶναι αὐτόν). These words of Luke have been taken to imply a special supernatural action on their senses on the part of the risen Christ 'who would not be seen by them till the time when He saw fit.' But the words need not be pressed into conveying such a meaning.² They may mean simply that they did not know Him; that there was that about Him which caused them not to recognize Him. And the writer of the Mark appendix explicitly attributes the fact to an objective alteration of His bodily conditions of existence. He appeared to them, he says, 'in another form' (Mk 16¹², ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ). So great, indeed, was the change in outward form that the sight of Him inspired the eleven disciples with fear. They were 'terrified and affrighted,' and 'supposed that they beheld a spirit' (Lk 24³⁷).

From all which it is evident that, according to the Evangelic narratives, the Resurrection body, whatever it was, was not simply the former natural body 'reanimated' or 'resuscitated' and restored to the former conditions of existence. It was changed and adapted to a new and higher form of existence (ἐν ἑτέρᾳ μορφῇ). A veritable body it was—no phantasmal or ghostly apparition—the same body, indeed, that was crucified, but now, it would seem, partaking of a more ethereal character, existing, in Origen's words, in a form 'as it were intermediate between the gross corporeality of the body before

² See Plummer, in 'International Critical Commentary' on Lk 24¹⁶.

the passion and the state of the soul when destitute of such a body.¹

III.

In full accord with this representation of the Evangelists is the teaching of Paul in 1 Co 15, which is recognized by all critics to be our oldest and most trustworthy account of the risen Lord's appearances. There a distinction is drawn between the crucified 'psychical' body (σῶμα ψυχικόν), the vehicle of self-manifestation under earthly conditions; and the risen 'pneumatical' or 'spiritual' body (σῶμα πνευματικόν), the fit organ of self-manifestation under supra-terrestrial conditions. Between the two there was identity. Paul's interest in the empty grave implies that. But the identity lay not, as many of the early Church fathers supposed,² in any material continuity of particles or organs, or in identity of visible form. 'Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God' (v.⁵⁰).³ The relation between the two is compared by Paul to the relation between the seed, the 'bare grain, and the full-grown blade of corn. The two are so unlike that no one who had seen the former only could conceive of the latter. 'Thou sowest not the body that shall be' (v. 37). The identity lay rather, as Origen and the Alexandrians maintained, in the continuity or permanence of the 'spirit' or 'germinative principle' which gives the 'law' (λόγος, ratio) of its constitution and moulds or fashions the body so as to make it the fitting vehicle of its manifestation under varying conditions.⁴ The 'spiritual' body, that is to say, was a body suited to be a more perfect vehicle and expression of spirit than the earthly material body—"spiritual," not because it was less than before material, but because in it matter was wholly and

finally subjugated to spirit and not to the exigencies of physical life.⁵ It had become the pure and transparent vehicle of spiritual purpose' (Gore, *Body of Christ*, p. 127).

Now, if 'spiritual things are spiritually discerned,' may it not reasonably be held that the risen 'spiritual' body of Christ was invisible to the mere natural eye of sense *apart from an inward spiritual susceptibility*? Even if we grant that the visible and tangible manifestations of the risen Christ to the disciples during the forty days were essentially temporary in character—an accommodation to their earthly senses for evidential purposes, in order, that is, to establish the fact of the Resurrection in their doubting minds and thus re-establish their faith,—were not these manifestations in part spiritually conditioned? That His appearance to unbelievers would have served no real purpose, inasmuch as it would have conveyed no proper meaning, we may admit. But is there not ground for going further and maintaining that such an appearance or manifestation was in the nature of the case impossible? When the risen Christ presented Himself bodily to the senses of the disciples, in every instance it would seem they required, in addition to the outward appearance, some more inward personal token or sign before they recognized the presence as that of their risen Lord. Mary recognized Him only after He had awakened former associations within her by naming her in the old familiar tenderness of tone (Jn 20¹⁶). The two disciples on the way to Emmaus knew not who their fellow-traveller was until something in His manner of taking and breaking the bread recalled past days (Lk 24³¹).⁶ And the disciples by the lake were led to recognition of Him only after the repetition of an act which struck a chord in their remembrance, His filling their net with fish (Jn 21^{6, 12}).

⁵ The partaking of food by the risen body (Lk 24⁴¹⁻⁴³) has been pointed to as irrefragable evidence of a natural physical mode of existence. But the power of eating was no proof of the necessity of eating. The partaking of food was evidential, made to convince the disciples that they were not seeing a ghost; cf. John of Damascus, *De fid. orth.* 4¹, *ἐλ καὶ ἐγένετο βρώσεως μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν ἀλλ' οὐ νόμου φύσεως· οὐ γὰρ ἐπεινάσεν*. The trend of recent science is in the direction of supporting the Pauline view of the 'spiritual body.' See, e.g., Sir Oliver Lodge in *Hibbert*, January 1906, pp. 318 ff.

⁶ The suggestion of Paulus and others that it was the marks of the nails in the hands, which became visible in the act of breaking the bread, is without any support in the narratives.

¹ Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 62: . . . ὥσπερ ἐν μεθορίῳ τινὶ τῆς παχύτητος τοῦ πρὸ τοῦ πάθους σώματος καὶ τοῦ γυμνῆς τοιοῦτον σώματος φαίνεσθαι ψυχῇν.

² So Tertullian, Jerome, and even Augustine. This is a fact too often unrecognized in modern discussions of the subject. Frequently the case against the Resurrection is argued as if it were merely a question of a dead man returning to life again. So, e.g., Renan *ut sup.*, and more recently Lake (*Historical Evidence for the Resurrection*). The Resurrection of Jesus is a fact of a quite different kind from the revivification of Lazarus. This latter was only a re-entrance on the former physical conditions of existence—a 'resuscitated corpse'—and was destined again to meet death.

³ 'Flesh and blood,' not 'flesh and bones'; cf. Lk 24³⁹.

⁴ See Westcott on 'Origen' in *Dict. of Chr. Biog.* iv. 138, footnote.

One recorded appearance there is which might seem to militate against this position—the appearance, namely, of the risen Jesus to Paul on the way to Damascus. Paul himself classes this appearance in the same category with the appearances to the other Apostles during the forty days.¹ But Paul at the time of the glorified Christ's appearance to him was still an unbeliever, an enemy of Jesus Christ, and a 'devastator' of the faith (Gal 1²³, ἐπόρθει). He was, indeed, on his way to Damascus, there to enter upon a fresh course of 'menace and bloodshed' (Ac 9¹, ἐπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόβου). Saul the prosecutor, however, had not been without his inward questionings. He had felt the prick of the goad (Ac 26¹⁴), though up to the moment of Christ's appearance to him he had steeled his mind and will against it. To his conscience and heart the risen Jesus now by direct supernatural action appealed: 'I am Jesus whom thou persecutest' (v.¹⁵); and it was that inward visitation or appeal which enabled him to recognize in the outward sensible

¹ He uses ὡφθη of both alike. 1 Co 15⁸, ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων . . . ὡφθη κάμοι. The word seems to have been current in the Apostolic Church for a personal experience of the appearances of the risen Christ. Twice at least after his conversion Paul believed himself to have seen the Lord, but these later visions he places in a different category from the vision that caused his conversion.

signs the person of the risen Jesus, whose followers he was persecuting, and created in him the lifelong conviction that he had seen the Lord. His fellow-travellers—equally with him—saw the light flash from the sky, and were struck down to the ground by the sight; and when they were risen again to their feet, they also heard the sound which followed. But Paul alone saw the Lord and heard His voice. He alone was capable of having the vision in its fulness. For only in him did the inward combine with the outward, the spiritual with the sensible, to effect a real 'appearance' of the risen Christ.

Is it not a fair inference, then, from the facts adduced, that the body of the risen Christ as 'spiritual' was inaccessible to the senses of all but those possessed of a certain inward spiritual receptiveness? His outward manifestation of Himself, in short, to men, if a revelation on His part was also a discovery on their part. If this can be established, then one thing follows: The restriction to believers of the recorded appearances of the risen Christ, so far from being a ground of objection to the Evangelic narratives—as it has been made from Celsus downwards,—becomes rather an additional corroboration and attestation of their historical trustworthiness.

Literature.

THE LAND OF THE HITTITES.

THOSE who possess Dr. Wright's *Empire of the Hittites*, which was published in 1884, should place beside it Professor Garstang's *Land of the Hittites*, published in 1910 (Constable; 12s. 6d. net). We cannot conceive a better way of showing the advance that has been made within the last five-and-twenty years in our knowledge of the ancient East. Five-and-twenty years hence another book will be written on the Hittites which will show as great an advance in knowledge. For with all that we know about the Hittites, there is much of which we are ignorant; we only know that we are on the eve of more and greater discoveries. But for that we must wait. Meantime we have Professor Garstang's book, which brings our knowledge right up to date. It is a great book. For the

subject is a greater one than some have realized yet, and Professor Garstang rises to the height of it. One of our most experienced explorers, he has lately made the Hittites the special field of his exploration. And if his name is not associated with them as is the name of Professor Winckler, we are quite sure that he has written a better book about them than Professor Winckler could have written.

The difference between Dr. Wright and Professor Garstang is due chiefly to the entrance of Asia Minor. Professor Sayce writes an introductory note. In that note he tells us that whereas scientific excavations have long been carried on in Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, and Palestine, it is now the turn of Asia Minor, both north and south of the Taurus. And there are indications, he says, that the revelation which Asia Minor and the

neighbouring lands of Syria have in store for us will be even more startling than that which has come from Egypt and Babylonia. There we already knew that great empires and wide-reaching cultures had once flourished; the earlier history of Asia Minor, on the other hand, was a blank. But the blank is beginning to be filled up, and we are learning that there too an empire once existed, which contended on equal terms with those of the Nile and the Euphrates, and possessed a culture that formed a link between the east and the west.

What has hitherto been done to fill up the blank will be found in Professor Garstang's *The Land of the Hittites*, and nothing is spared in the way of excellent illustration to make the book acceptable.

THE FOURTH GOSPEL.

The authorship of the Fourth Gospel is still an open question. We say so after reading an immense volume which has been written by Professor Bacon of Yale against the Johannine authorship. For there is no living scholar, in our judgment, who is more conscientious or more courageous than Professor Bacon, and none who knows the subject better. This, then, is the utmost that can be said against the belief that this Gospel was written by the Apostle John. And it is an open question still. Professor Bacon deals separately with the external and with the internal evidence. His handling of the external evidence is masterly and minute. With the internal evidence he is not so much at home. But whether it is external or internal, there is far too much evidence in favour of the Apostle left unexplained. And above everything else there remains the difficulty of finding an author. The question forces itself on one's mind at every step. How is it possible for a man who could write a book like this, to write it and immediately drop out of sight? If we were reviewing a book in favour of the Johannine authorship, we should lay stress on the difficulties that stand in the way of that belief. For the difficulties are many and great. All we contend for now is that the question of the authorship is still unsolved. And we contend for it after reading with an open mind the strongest book on the negative side that has yet been written in English.

Some of the book has already appeared in the form of articles in magazines. But it is none the worse for that. These articles were part of a com-

plete subject. When brought together they fit into their place without any trouble. For it is long since Professor Bacon had his mind fully made up. He is not one of those who write to clear their own minds or to give themselves courage; he writes always to prove to others the things that are most certainly believed by himself. The title of the book is *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* (Fisher Unwin; 15s. net).

HISTORY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

The Rev. James MacCaffrey, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, is astonished that his *History of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century* (Gill & Son; 2 vols.) should, within a very few months, have reached a second edition. There is nothing to be astonished at. The nineteenth century covers the career of Wiseman, of Manning, of Newman; it covers the period of the Catholic emancipation and of disestablishment in Ireland; and these persons and things are still of so intense an interest and so far-reaching an influence that a book which gave a complete and unbiassed account of them, even if it contained nothing else, was sure of a widespread welcome. Professor MacCaffrey writes the history of his Church not only in great Britain and Ireland, but throughout the whole world. And he does undoubtedly write it with less prejudice than we should have thought possible in a man who believes so whole-heartedly in its exclusive mission to the world.

To these three things, then, its fairness, its comprehensiveness, and the nearness of the events it describes, may be chiefly attributed the book's success. Professor MacCaffrey is no stylist. He is not always precise in the choice of his words; he has no ear for rhythm. But style is not greatly taken into account now in historical writing. History has become much more a science than an art. So long as the historian verifies his references and arrives at sensible conclusions, his work is readily accepted.

It was inevitable that Ireland should occupy large space in the book. To all but an Irishman, the space will appear out of proportion. But there is this compensation, that if the rest is good, the Irish chapters are supremely good.

The whole production of the book, in spite of

one or two slips in the proof-reading (the most important we have noticed is on p. 54 of vol. ii.), reflects credit on author, printer, and publisher.

THE SIGNS AND SYMBOLS OF PRIMORDIAL MAN.

Mr. Albert Churchward, M.D., M.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., F.G.S., P.M., P.Z., believes that all the religious doctrines in the world, and all the symbols that have ever been used to express them, have descended from the ancient Egyptians and the ideas they had of the world to come. He has published a large volume under the title of *The Signs and Symbols of Primordial Man* (Sonnenschein; 25s. net). In that volume, which is plentifully illustrated, the whole earth is ransacked for evidence of the author's thesis. You must not, however, suggest that he formed a thesis first, and then went about to collect the evidence for it. He contends most earnestly that the information contained in his book is right and true, 'the same having been obtained from existing facts, which can be proved by any person devoting his attention to the subject.'

Unfortunately Mr. Churchward has never learned the art of composition. The first paragraph of his introduction occupies four large octavo pages. The first paragraph of the preface is shorter, but it is no better English. Let us quote it.

'In writing the explanation of the Signs and Symbols of Primordial Man, I have gone back to the foundation of the human as a beginning, and traced these signs from the first Pygmies, and their then meaning, up to the latter-day Christians, and shown the evolution and meaning of the same, back to the Primordial Signs and Symbols and Sign Language, which have never been studied or taken into account, so far as I am aware, either in Freemasonry, the Christian doctrines; or the Eschatology of the Egyptians, and without which it is impossible to form a true conception of how these later doctrines came into existence. Without these signs, only a false conception of the ancient Egyptians, their ideas as to the future life, and their belief in the immortality of the soul, could only be erroneous—as indeed we find with most writers on the subject at the present day, their studies and knowledge only going back as far as the Osirian period, which is very recent, comparatively.'

We are not foolhardy enough to criticise the contents of the book. Dr. Churchward wrote a book some time ago on the origin and antiquity of Freemasonry; and some one reviewing it, remarked that a little Egyptian knowledge is a dangerous thing. 'His observation,' retorts Dr. Churchward, 'is true, and most applicable to critics of his *métier*, but does not concern writers who have devoted many years to the study of Egyptology. It would certainly add to the value of the *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum* if the reviewers learned something first of the subject they attempt to criticise, and did not hazard an opinion on a subject of the alphabet of whose language they are ignorant.'

The misinterpretation of nature has much to do with the difficulty which men of science seem to feel in associating themselves with the Church. And the misinterpretation is not all on one side. The Rev. H. Farquhar, B.D., has written a little book—it is one of the 'Guild Text-Books'—on *The Interpretation of Nature* (Black; 6d. net). He admits frankly and quite cheerfully that the Bible does not contain a scientific interpretation of nature. Its science, he says, is loose and inaccurate and is now superseded. But, on the other hand, he shows that the Bible contains an accurate interpretation of nature, an interpretation that is both poetic and spiritual. That is the interpretation which the man of science is invited to consider. The little book will work wonders in the way of reconciliation if both sides can be induced to read it.

Theodore Parker was at his best in prayer. He could not pray in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and it is such a pity that he could not. But he held communion with God as Father, a communion which we need not hesitate to say he reached through Jesus Christ, though he did not know or acknowledge it. And in that communion all the strife is forgotten; the gulf of separation is filled up; at one with God, he is at one with us. And so, as it is fitting that in the hundredth year after his birth a new edition of his *Prayers* should be published, it is also very welcome. The edition has been edited by the Rev. Charles Hargrove of Leeds, for the British and Foreign Unitarian Association (1s. net).

What is Christianity? This is the question to which the Rev. N. Macnicol, M.A., has written an answer under the title of *The Religion of Jesus*. The book is intended for the use of missionaries in India, and it is published by the Christian Literature Society for India (rs.). But it will be of service everywhere. Mr. Macnicol, one of the missionaries of the United Free Church of Scotland, is a very competent scholar, and writes with great simplicity.

The new volume of the Revised Version for Schools is *The First Book of the Kings* (Cambridge University Press; 1s. 6d. net). The editor is the Rev. H. C. O. Lanchester, M.A., formerly Fellow of Pembroke College. The editor of this series is more careful in selecting his authors than was the original editor of the 'Cambridge Bible for Schools.'

When Professor Andrew Halliday Douglas was Presbyterian minister in Cambridge, he wrote a thesis for the B.A. degree on *The Philosophy and Psychology of Pietro Pomponazzi*. After many years the thesis has now been edited by his brother—Dr. Charles Douglas—and Dr. R. P. Hardie, and has been published by the Cambridge University Press (7s. 6d. net). Three men, each of exceptional intellectual ability, have given themselves to the making of the book; and, in spite of the limited interest that is now taken in the Schoolmen, it is not at all unlikely that this volume, which describes the last of them, will obtain a considerable circulation. Professor Halliday Douglas saw clearly and wrote clearly. The reader may depend upon it that whatever Pietro Pomponazzi has for this generation will be found in this book. We look upon it, both for its subject and for the treatment of its subject, as a model for all those who have a thesis to write.

It must have been difficult for Mr. Edward Mortimer Chapman to find a title for his book. The title he has chosen, *English Literature and Religion* (Constable; 8s. 6d. net), is not distinctive enough. His purpose is, on the one hand, to set forth the debt which literature owes to religion for its subjects, its language, its antagonisms, and its inspirations; and, on the other hand, to suggest the debt which religion owes to literature for the extension of its influence and the humanizing of its ideals.

It is a large subject. Mr. Chapman has been wise to restrict the range of it. He deals with the writers of the nineteenth century only. He does not, however, plunge us straight into the literature of the nineteenth century. He leads us towards it by two introductory lectures of considerable length. In these lectures, and especially in their treatment of Burns, there is much courageous writing. 'As so often happens in both literature and life, the religious element in Burns shows to best advantage when it is implicit. He hated hypocrisy, and, like many a conscience-smitten man, exalted his hatred into a special virtue. "Holy Willie's Prayer," for instance, is a diatribe acrid enough to have come from the pen of Churchill or of Junius. It is an attack upon ultra-Calvinism in general,—which was sufficiently justifiable; and upon a certain William Fisher in particular,—which nothing could justify. So in the "Holy Fair," with its innuendoes and personalities, there is far less Christian spirit than in the rollicking stanzas of the "Jolly Beggars," a poem which for genuine inspiration must take precedence of the far more famous "Tam o' Shanter." But the "Lines to a Mountain Daisy," to the mouse whose poor home was invaded by his ploughshare, the closing stanzas of his "Address to the Unco Guid," and especially—

A man's a man for a' that

are instinct with the very spirit of the Gospel.
Somewhere this man

learned the touch that speeds
Right to the natural heart of things!
Struck rootage down to where Life feeds
At the eternal Springs.'

Whatever this does for Burns, it throws some light upon Mr. Chapman. His manner is never less free and daring throughout the book. He calls Wordsworth and Coleridge the 'sons of the morning,' Carlyle and Ruskin he calls 'Elijah and Elisha.' He is able to appreciate Mr. Thomas Hardy.

The Wesleyan Book Room deserves the thanks of the whole Christian world for the persistent courage of its publications on the social problem. Every other month a new volume appears, and every new volume is instinct with life and earnestness. The latest is *The Social Outlook* (Culley;

rs. net). It contains Papers on Social Problems read at the Second Oxford Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Union for Social Service.

The fortieth Fernley Lecture was delivered by the Rev. Edward J. Brailsford. Where did he go for a subject? He went far away from all the beaten tracks of the Fernley Lecturers. He went to the legendary lore that has gathered round the narratives of the Old and New Testaments. Where he found these legends he does not always say, which is a pity. It would be convenient to have a storehouse of them at hand. But, in truth, he is not so much concerned with the source of the legends as with their meaning. His interest is not literary but devotional, not intellectual but spiritual. Wherever he got them, he quotes them freely, sometimes in the words of his source, and sometimes in his own words, but always for the purpose of bringing out the spiritual meaning underlying them. The title of his book is *The Spiritual Sense in Sacred Legend* (Culley; 3s. 6d.).

Here are two volumes of sermon essays, both published by Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls. *Dominion and Power* (5s.), by Mr. Charles Brodie Patterson, is in its seventh edition, so that there is evidently a market for the sermon-essay. No doubt the market is mainly an American one; and indeed the essay which is also a sermon is a peculiar product of modern American life, where the resolution to make the best of both worlds is more determined than it has ever been in the history of this earth. The way to make the best of both worlds is just what the sermon-essay proposes to show. It must be admitted that this world has the lion's share of attention. That perhaps accounts for the success of this form of literature. But at least it is always maintained that character is necessary to true success. And how can character be attained without a background of eternity?

The other volume is called *The Good of Life, and Other Little Essays* (5s.). Among the subjects of the essays are the Dance Question, Outspokenness, the Elusive in Poetry, and Is it right sometimes to Lie? The author of this volume is Professor William Cleaver Wilkinson.

Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls have published another volume of the same kind. But this time it is a translation. It is a translation made by

Marian Lindsay from the French of Dora Melegari. The title is *Makers of Sorrow and Makers of Joy* (5s.).

Messrs. Gowans & Gray of Glasgow are the publishers of the 'Pocket Anthologies' (6d. net). No. 7 contains *Characteristic Passages from the Hundred Best Prose-Writers in the English Language*.

That there is a spreading, and rapidly spreading, interest in the study of religion is proved by the number of books on the subject which are pouring from the press. Harper's 'Library of Living Thought' is not necessarily religious; yet of the seventeen volumes now issued eleven are distinctly so. The latest is Professor E. A. Gardner's *Religion and Art in Ancient Greece* (2s. 6d. net). It is a delightful little book. The members of the family to which Professor Gardner belongs have all the gift of style, and they are all scholars. Moreover, this is Professor E. A. Gardner's special subject. There is no one living who knows it more intimately.

Dr. T. Todd-Potts of Gorleston-on-Sea is the publisher of his own poems. The small volume we have seen is entitled *Lays of Faith and Love* (2s. 6d.). It contains a tribute to the memory of King Edward VII., and another to the memory of His Majesty King Oscar of Sweden. But for the most part the theme is human love in one or other of its many manifestations.

The versatility of Professor Flinders Petrie is astounding. When we thought he was digging and deciphering in Egypt, we find he was working out a new solution of the Synoptic problem. His solution of the problem is just as enterprising and original as we should expect it to be. But, after all, there is a connexion between cause and effect. He has reached his solution after looking at the Logia or Sayings of Jesus which have been discovered in Egypt. These Logia are separate fragments. There is the same difference between them and a gospel as there is between a notebook and a treatise. Now, let us suppose that there were a great number of such Logia in existence at the beginning. Suppose, further, that Mark gathered a number of them together, gave them links of connexion and produced a gospel.

Suppose that Matthew and Luke got hold of Mark's collection and added other separate Logia to it, and so made other gospels. Professor Flinders Petrie believes that this, or something like this, is the way in which the present Synoptic Gospels came into existence.

What is the test of his solution? It is that the difference between one Gospel and another is not a difference of words and phrases. It is a difference of episodes; that is to say, of portions containing a narrative or a saying which can stand by itself as a whole. Professor Flinders Petrie has presented his theory with amazing attractiveness in a little volume which he calls *The Growth of the Gospels* (Murray).

Under the curious title of *Old Theology* (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net), the Rev. W. H. K. Soames, M.A., has published 'an attempt to expound some of the difficult or obscure or misunderstood texts, passages, and expressions in the New Testament.' Mr. Soames is a keen, earnest evangelical. And he is conscious of it. Much of the exposition is apologetic, but being honest exposition it is all the better for that. One of the passages most fully handled is Jn 3⁸⁻⁸, the passage which deals with the fact and circumstances of the new birth. Mr. Soames draws a sharp distinction between the new birth and conversion. He insists just as sharply that the new birth is not due to baptism. But the passage which receives most attention of all is Mt 26²⁶⁻²⁸, which begins with the words, 'And as they were eating.' The handling of this passage will be a discovery to those who did not already know that Mr. Soames is one of the best-equipped theologians of our time.

The Government of Eastern Bengal and Assam has taken in hand to publish a series of volumes describing the native tribes for whose welfare it is responsible. The volumes are issued in London by Mr. David Nutt. Already we have received those dealing with the Khasis, the Mikirs, and the Meitheis. The new volume deals with *The Garos*. Its author is Major A. Playfair, I.A. The religion of these tribes, which is the most interesting thing about them, will be described in the *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS*. Major Playfair devotes forty pages to the religion of the Garos. Speaking of their beliefs about death, he says that in the human body there lives a spirit, which, on

being released from its mortal covering, wends its way to Mangru-Mangram, the abode of spirits. Mangru-Mangram, which is now believed to be situated on Chikmang, an isolated peak of the Garo hills, is a kind of purgatory, through which all must pass, good and bad alike. On arriving, the spirit inquires for his relatives, builds his house beside them, and works at the trade he worked at on earth. But Mangru-Mangram is not a place of joy or rest, and the spirit ever hopes for a reincarnation.

The new volume of the R.T.S. Devotional Commentary is *The First Epistle General of St. John* (2s.). The editor is the Rev. G. S. Barrett, D.D. The volume will rank with the best work in the series. Dr. Barrett as an expositor is not easily surpassed. From his volume on the Temptation, published so long ago as 1883, down to this volume, every book he has published has been the outcome of conscientious study and clear thought.

The Semitic series has been enriched by a volume of *Tales and Maxims from the Talmud* (Routledge; 5s. net). The tales and maxims have been selected, arranged, and translated by the Rev. Samuel Rapaport. The book opens with a reprint of Deutsch's famous Essay on the Talmud. And we welcome the reprint. But it is made almost unnecessary by the excellent introduction which Mr. Rapaport himself writes.

Take an example of the precepts: 'Be thou the cursed, not he who curses. Be of them that are persecuted, not of them that persecute. Look at Scripture: there is not a single bird more persecuted than the dove; yet God has chosen her to be offered up on his altar. The bull is hunted by the lion, the sheep by the wolf, the goat by the tiger. And God said, "Bring me a sacrifice, not from them that persecute, but from them that are persecuted."'

Let the example of the tales be a tale of Rabbi Akiba. On his way home one day he met Jonathan, the brother of Dosé, of whom his brother says that he could give a hundred answers to every question he was asked. But he was also fond of asking questions, and when he met Rabbi Akiba he unloaded a host of problems which the famous Rabbi failed to solve. "'Art thou Akiba, the famous Akiba?'" asked this

infant terrible. "It is nice to have fame; but in my opinion you do not know enough to be qualified for the position of a herdsman of oxen." So far from being offended by this disparaging remark, the meek Rabbi Akiba added a rider, "Aye, not even as a herdsman of sheep." So the famous Akiba was the famous Akiba after all.

St. Paul and his Converts is the title which the Rev. Harrington C. Lees gives to a small volume of studies in the Pauline Epistles (Robert Scott; 1s. net). Mr. Lees always finishes his work. This book has more in it than some formal Introductions, though it is so unpretentious.

Psychism, by M. Hume (Walter Scott; 2s. 6d. net), has seven sections. The titles of the sections are Hallucinations, Force, Soul, Fore-knowledge, Sub-conscious Memory, General Sub-conscious Action, and Mysticism. Each section is divided into short paragraphs. Here is a paragraph from the Hallucinations: 'During two years I had a servant who amused me by her habit of saying "Good-morning" and "Good-night" twice over; first with her internal body-voice, not audible to herself, but quite audible to me, and then properly and externally. She was rather scared when at last I told her of it!'

Chronology has a curious fascination for some minds. And Bible Chronology has the additional attraction of a vindication of the accuracy of Holy Scripture. Drawn by this twofold cord, Canon R. B. Girdlestone has published *Outlines of Bible Chronology Illustrated from External Sources* (S.P.C.K.; 2s.).

The Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, lectures on the Thirty-nine Articles. He recommends no text-book. If he is asked what text-

book he recommends to his students, he answers the library. But he dictates outlines. And these outlines he has now printed and published, not for the use of his own students only, but for the use and to the great advantage of students and lecturers everywhere. The title is, *Lecture Outlines on the Thirty-nine Articles*, by Arthur J. Tait, B.D. (Stock; 3s. net).

For the encouragement of those who are trying to recover the lost art of pulpit exposition, the Rev. D. Macfadyen, M.A., has published an exposition of the prophet Malachi, which he delivered in lectures on Sunday mornings to the congregations worshipping at the Highgate Congregational Church. The success of the lectures will make the book successful. And others will be encouraged to attempt what he has done so easily and so well. The title of the book is *The Messenger of God* (Elliot Stock; 2s. net).

Mr. F. C. Conybeare has issued a new edition of his *Myth, Magic, and Morals* (Watts; 4s. 6d. net). He himself, however, calls it simply a reprint. He says: 'A few insignificant verbal changes have been made in the text, and such clerical errors corrected as had been noticed by reviewers or detected by myself. Several additions have also been made to the notes at the end of the book.' But there is also a new preface. In that preface Mr. Conybeare replies to Professor Sanday. Professor Sanday reviewed the first edition in a pamphlet which he entitled *A New Marcion*. It is to that pamphlet Mr. Conybeare replies. But it is a disappointing reply. Not a position is seriously defended. Mr. Conybeare simply repeats the not very original statement that there are two Christs, the historical Christ and the Christ of the Church. He expects us to draw the inference that his is the historical Christ.

Christologies Ancient and Modern.

BY THE REV. H. R. MACKINTOSH, D. PHIL., D.D., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY
IN THE NEW COLLEGE, EDINBURGH.

AN exposition of Dr. Sanday's 'new and unexplored' theory of our Lord's Person ought, so far as may be, to keep sedulously to the words he

himself has chosen, for the matter is one of some preciseness and delicacy. We may perhaps start with this summary statement, which comes at the

end of a lecture on Presuppositions: 'The proper seat or *locus* of all divine indwelling, or divine action upon the human soul, is the subliminal consciousness. And . . . the same, or the corresponding, subliminal consciousness is the proper seat or *locus* of the Deity of the incarnate Christ.' The gist of the new tentative modern Christology is contained in these words.

Nearly five years ago Principal Dykes had with great caution pointed in something very like this direction, and it is remarkable that Dr. Sanday should quite independently have come out at exactly the same spot. 'Our best hope of understanding the dual life of our Lord,' wrote Dr. Dykes, 'may lie in the humble study of our own personal life. There are whole regions of psychical phenomena, little attended to till of late, which betray the existence in the soul of subconscious states and processes of psychic life.' He goes on to give familiar examples of this. Not that the analogy between our personality and that of Christ seems to him either close or satisfying; in the nature of the case that cannot be. But what it does suggest 'is that within the mysterious depths of a single personality, there may co-exist parallel states of spirit life, one only of which emerges in ordinary human consciousness. They may serve to repel the superficial objection that such a dualism is impossible.' Dr. Sanday takes up the same idea in his own way, working it out with a good deal of illustrative detail, and furnishing what I feel may well come to be regarded as the classical interpretation of it. It is a conception at which not a few students of the subject have recently been gazing with a hopeful interest. One of the sanest and most acute thinkers in our ministry wrote to me not long since: 'Dr. Dykes' idea has interested me for some years now—I mean the grounding of the Divine in the subliminal in Jesus. . . . I should not wonder if we need to think ourselves into the subliminal, before we can ever begin to do justice to the conception of it. What if the relation between the subliminal and the supraliminal be the really important question for us? In ideal man there would be a free flow to and fro between the two spheres.' The idea is in the air, and we may take it that thoughtful men are going to look at it undeterred by scorn or misconception.¹

¹ Cf. an able and lucid chapter in the Rev. N. Macnicol's *Religion of Jesus* (Christian Literature for India, 1910), pp. 53 ff.

Personally I am as yet unconvinced; but this need not, I hope, prevent the inquiry which follows from being a quite impartial one. We have to ask what the objections are which such an hypothesis invites, and whether it is a solution that can permanently be maintained?

In a preliminary way the emphasis of Dr. Sanday's welcome to the idea of the subconscious is striking. In his fine chapter on the subject we cannot help noticing a certain tendency to speak as if it were decidedly more important than the conscious. Thus on p. 145 we read: 'The wonderful thing is that, while the unconscious and subconscious processes are (generally speaking) similar in kind to the conscious, they surpass them in degree. They are subtler, intenser, further-reaching, more penetrating. It is something more than a mere metaphor when we describe the sub- and unconscious states as more "profound."' The work of the Holy Spirit is subliminal; it belongs to the lower sphere. A favourite metaphor with Dr. Sanday to represent the two levels of psychic life is the 'finely poised needle on the face of a dial. The really important thing is not the index, but the weight or the pressure that moves the index. And that, in the case of moral character and religious motive, is out of sight, down in the lowest depths of personality' (p. 158). In the same way he speaks elsewhere of the unconscious 'as containing the key to moral problems.' The general drift of these passages, one feels, is somehow to exalt the subconscious and abysmal at the expense of ordinary consciousness. I am not sure whether Dr. Sanday quite goes all the way with Mr. Myers in regarding the subliminal consciousness as primary and superior—the ordinary mental life being derived from it—rather than its originating source, as psychology has held; but he quotes Mr. Myers without criticism to the effect that 'there exists a more comprehensive consciousness, a profounder faculty . . . from which the consciousness and the faculty of earth-life are mere selections.'² We shall return to this point; for the present we make a note of it. Whether the subconscious is or is not the source of the conscious, it is at least in Dr. Sanday's view superior to it; and for that reason presumably a worthier receptacle of Deity.

Another introductory conception is that of the *Unio Mystica*. The indwelling of God in the soul

² Italics mine.

may be taken as (so to speak) the limiting case of Divine Immanence, and the mystical union so construed is an analogy helping us further to conceive the Incarnation. As Dr. Sanday put it in a former work: 'The Holy Spirit is the bond which binds all humanity together in one. In each one of us He is present after our measure, but in Christ He dwelt as the fulness of the Godhead bodily.'¹ We get some aid from the idea that the human spirit is capable of penetration by the Divine, but still more from combining this second mystical conception with the thought of what we have already called the subliminal. 'The deepest truth of mysticism, and of the states of which we have been speaking as mystical, belongs not so much to the upper region of consciousness—the region of symptoms, manifestations, effects—as to the lower region of the unconscious' (p. 155). Here also we are obliged to ask whether mysticism of the kind undoubtedly present in the New Testament is even congruous, let alone bound up with the idea that the subconscious is a profounder or (in some spiritual sense) more important parallel to ordinary conscious life. Can anything be so important as the conscious and active faith that unites the soul to Christ? One can quite well understand how stress should come to be laid on unconscious process in the interest of a less than ethical theory of the sacraments, but it is just to add that in this volume Dr. Sanday has uttered not one syllable connecting his new hypothesis with ulterior questions of that kind. That there is a buried life of the soul, an 'underworld' or lower region of the unconscious, and that in believers it also is pervaded by the Spirit of Christ, is surely undeniable; but it receives its content and quality, a sound psychology must hold, from what goes on in consciousness, and is itself, as Professor Stout puts it, 'an organized system of conditions which have indeed been formed in and through bygone conscious experience, but which are not themselves present to consciousness.'² I grant the difficulty of explaining on these terms how, say, infants can have a real relation to the love of God prior to the waking of the moral consciousness; but on that subject it seems best to say that *for them* that relation is not such as we are able to interpret; while, on the other hand, our confidence that it is entirely real and redeeming springs from

the knowledge of the Divine character which we owe to Christ. What it seems impossible to grant on any terms is that the unconscious is 'higher' than the conscious. True it is that

'From the soul's subterranean depths upborne,
As from an infinitely distant land,
Come airs and floating echoes';

but, in the first place, these 'murmurs and scents of an infinite sea' are due to traces or dispositions formed in the course of previous conscious experience; secondly, they become significant for us only as they emerge into the upper stream of conscious life. Only then can we assign to them spiritual value. We all of us, for example, are already united in dim, unconscious relation to the whole historic past; but if that relation never came into clear awareness it might just as well be non-existent. Subliminal process, therefore, is the indispensable condition of all mental life; but psychology appears to class it not as the higher reality of the two, but rather as a subordinate and co-operant condition of the 'supraliminal.'

Dr. Sanday's use of the theory for the purposes of Christology is made clear in an important passage which I quote nearly in full. 'We have seen,' he writes, 'what difficulties are involved in the attempt to draw, as it were, a vertical line between the human nature and the divine nature of Christ, and to say that certain actions of His fall on one side of this line, and certain other actions on the other. But these difficulties disappear if, instead of drawing a vertical line, we rather draw a horizontal line between the upper human medium, which is the proper and natural field of all active expression, and those lower deeps which are no less the proper and natural home of whatever is divine. This line is inevitably drawn in the region of the subconscious. . . . Whatever there was of divine in Him, on its way to outward expression whether in speech or act, passed through, and could not but pass through, the restricting and restraining medium of human consciousness. This consciousness was, as it were, the narrow neck through which alone the divine could come to expression.' And he claims that 'the advantage of this way of conceiving of the Person of Christ is that it leaves us free to think of His life on earth as fully and frankly human, without at the same time fixing limits for it which confine it within the measures of the human; it leaves an opening,

¹ *The Life of Christ in Recent Research*, p. 310.

² *Hibbert Journal*, October 1903, p. 47.

which in any case must be left, by which the Deity of the Incarnate preserves its continuity with the infinitude of Godhead' (pp. 165-166).

Points to be carefully noted here are these. Dr. Sanday would lay a good deal of emphasis on the figure of 'the narrow neck' as applied to our Lord's human consciousness. In other words, the expression is human, completely human; but that which is expressed is neither human alone nor divine alone, but divine and human fused or blended. It is a mistake, that is, to equate the Divine and the unconscious; but the unconscious is at any rate the region in which the divine and the human merge in each other, and the divine so entering and mingling with our nature is continuous with the infinite Godhead. It is thus a cardinal point with the new theory to maintain that the influence of the one upon the other takes place below the point or line at which the resultant consciousness comes to expression. And if it be asked what ground we have for believing that there was in Christ 'a root of being striking down below the strata of consciousness, by virtue of which He was more than human,' Dr. Sanday in reply would simply indicate 'the marks which have been appealed to all down the centuries in proof that in Him Deity and humanity were combined' (p. 174).

Such, then, are the new suggestions of the book towards the Christological theory, and it is very possible that it may form a subject of no little discussion in the immediate future. The majority of readers will probably feel that the theory is in itself attractive, and I need scarcely add that the statement of it is a finely conceived piece of argumentative exposition. Dr. Sanday puts the hypothesis at its best and strongest. All will sympathize with his vital interest in the unity and consistency of Jesus' life, and with his unreserved acceptance of the position that 'there is no possible or desirable division between what is human in Him and what is divine.' How seriously this is meant comes out in a few pages, near the close, on the working of our Lord's consciousness, which I take leave to say belong to the very best that has been written on the subject, and ought to be read and re-read by every student. Had the book contained nothing more than the reasoned explication of this passage, it would have added greatly to our insight. Dr. Sanday has at least made it still clearer than before that the strict Two-Nature doctrine is

not the last word upon the subject, whether we do or do not accept the particular hypothesis he has put forward of the subliminal consciousness of Christ as the region where His Deity may be localized.

Now, in regard to this theory, as set forth in the passages just quoted, one cannot but feel the pressure of certain initial difficulties which it may be as well to express frankly.

(a) The superiority of the unconscious. I have already touched on this point, but we may recur to it. It seems to be an essential premise of the theory, but is it as a fact really tenable? It is hard for many of us to get over the objection that the subconscious has as such no moral character at all; and that out of it there well up all sorts of things, not only impulses which we are entitled to regard as divine, but also, as Dr. Sanday himself concedes, the really diabolical. From that region, it appears, derive not only the intuitions of genius and poetry, but the disordered and incoherent absurdities of dreams. If we are straitly charged to define the subconscious, indeed, we have to confess that we know nothing of it whatever save as process beneath the threshold of consciousness which indifferently co-operates in *all* mental construction, be the product of such construction from the ethical point of view good or bad. And the question at once arises: Are we justified in taking this half-lit region of psychic life, as to which our information is so largely a matter of hypothesis and inference,—it is, as Dr. Sanday admits, that part of the living self which is most beyond our ken,—and decide that *there* is the seat and dwelling-place of Deity; that there *par excellence* is a receptacle specially suited and adapted for the presence of God in man? Some people would maintain, I fancy, that the subliminal is that in us which approximates most nearly to the mysterious faculty or aptitude which we call instinct, and that it is for that reason akin rather to the animal than to the divine; and such arguments would require very grave consideration. At all events, Professor James seems hardly entitled to affirm that the subconscious is continuous—if by this he means homogeneous—with our conscious life; even if it be a *part* of a self, it is not therefore a self *suo jure*, but at most machinery subservient to the rational and ethical life of the Ego; and we cannot acknowledge that what belongs rather to the natural conditions out of which self-consciousness rises can be superior in worth or (so to speak)

spiritual status to self-consciousness proper. Or, to put it otherwise, 'the subliminal' is a form embracing a very dimly known content those changes or processes below the threshold of consciousness which we see are required to explain what goes on in normal mental life; have we any right to take that form, abstracted from the only content known to be associated with it, and assign to it the very different content of Deity? How do we really know that the form and the content are now adapted or suited to each other, that the content *fits* the form?

(b) Is the drift of the theory not inevitably towards the older conception of Deity as essentially unknowable? I am speaking, of course, merely of the implicit logic of the theory as a whole. That dim sphere of mental life which we name the 'subliminal,' and which we find it practically impossible to describe in genuinely positive terms, is taken to be the dwelling-place of Godhead; of Godhead, too, as coming so near to manhood as to be conjoined with it in a single life. God is so close to us; yet, on second thoughts, so far away! For to the Christian mind God is love; and love is above all things conscious, ethical, rational. It is something that I find it quite impossible to translate into terms of the subconscious. We know what is meant by saying that the love that looked out of Christ's eyes, touching men's lives and making all things new for them, was the very personal love of God Himself, present by a vast act of sacrifice in a human personality; and there need be no hesitation in admitting that by this entrance into earthly experience the Son of God submitted to restraints and disabilities of self-expression; 'the condition which He was assuming,' as Dr. Sanday puts it, 'permitted only degrees of self-manifestation.' But how shall we construe to ourselves a Holy Love—a love identical with the very essence of Deity, making God indeed to be God—which yet resides in the unconscious? For we must not be misled by the term '*subliminal consciousness*' into thinking that the subconscious is really another kind or form of the conscious—a second self working (as it were) behind the curtain. Mr. Myers notoriously was tempted off into various exaggerations and inaccuracies of this kind, which led one of his critics to say that his theory had much affinity with 'such conceptions as that of a tutelary genius or guardian angel.' In reality, of course,

the subconscious is so far just the *unconscious*; and my difficulty in that case precisely is that the nature of the unconscious is indescribable by us in ethical or spiritual terms. Our Lord's life, we are told, is entirely human on the *surface* (p. 213); but there was beneath it a presence of Deity one in kind with that of God who rules the universe (p. 209). Yet since we are unable to characterize that Deity by epithets drawn from the human surface—love, holiness, wisdom, etc., all of them conscious attitudes or activities of mind—then, so far as I can see, it becomes for us simply the unknown and unknowable.

(c) I come now to what may be regarded as the gravest difficulty of all, I mean from the point of view of theory. Does the new hypothesis really help us to rise above the haunting dualism of tradition? I have already quoted a passage in which Dr. Sanday proposes that instead of a vertical line between the human nature and the divine nature of Christ, we should rather draw 'a horizontal line between the upper human medium, which is the proper and natural field of all active expression, and those lower deeps which are no less the proper and natural home of whatever is divine.' And we have to keep in view the phrases just noted as to the human surface and the divine depths beneath it. Now it is far from clear how these expressions are to be harmonized with the fundamental principle with which, like many of the best recent writers, Dr. Sanday operates, that to the believing study of our Lord's Person all that is divine in Him is human, all that is human is divine. Dr. Sanday will reply to this, I imagine, that the line in question 'is inevitably drawn *in the region of the subconscious*' (p. 166),¹ so that it is out of a subliminal whole in which the fusion of divine and human has already taken place that the resultant states of full consciousness actually rise. This, however, does not appear to me to get rid of the fact that, *ex hypothesi*, the consciousness is human only, so that to reach the divine in Jesus you have still to leave the specifically human behind. We still argue *from* the one *to* the other, instead of envisaging them as merged in a single divine-human consciousness. And more and more one's clear feeling is that if Godhead and manhood are one in Jesus—and faith is certain that they are—they must be both present everywhere in each part and region of His experience; with no

¹ Italics mine.

line, that is, between them of any kind which could obscure the vital fact that the character of God, which is ethical through and through, is actually being revealed in our human conditions.

But while I feel these objections strongly, and do not so far see how they are to be answered, I cannot think that it is just to reproach Dr. Sanday with saying no more about Christ than can be said of every man, simply because in every man humanity rests on a subliminal consciousness which is continuous with Deity. For one thing, an objection of this sort would hold equally against all theories of a real Incarnation, in so far as Incarnation *eo ipso* implies a congruity or kinship between God and man which renders their union possible; and Dr. Sanday does no more than give a special explanation of where, in his opinion, this congruity or meeting-point lies. God and man, he holds, are united in the subliminal region, and there it is that they were uniquely made one in Jesus. He may be wrong in much that he teaches as to the subliminal; so far I cannot myself see that he is always right; but at all events nothing in his theory is at all inconsistent with full adhesion to Christian belief in the divine uniqueness of Jesus. And for another thing, there is that in Jesus, on Dr. Sanday's own showing, the antecedents and origin of which mark Him off from all other children of men. The Deity that has its seat in the profounder consciousness of Jesus is defined as being an Incarnation of the Son, it is Deity

'one in kind with that of God who rules the universe.'

With the motives that animate Dr. Sanday's new theory and have guided him in its construction there is sure to be wide sympathy, a sympathy which it is to be hoped will take shape in frank and searching criticism from both sides. The subject is a fascinating one, and perhaps there are many to whom the new conception will be none the less attractive that in a modified form it may prove to be compatible with, or even introductory to, a modern reading of Kenoticism. Everything is of value that helps us to transcend the Two-Nature theory as handed on from the past, or that stimulates us to ask afresh how we can think of God as expressing Himself under the limitations of a human consciousness. It is no slight service to have these issues canvassed anew by a thinker of Dr. Sanday's independent power and thoroughness. And while I have felt bound to give unreserved expression to difficulties that occur on a first reading, I am conscious at the same time that his exposition has placed the central conception in a new light, and that we are no longer at liberty simply to put it aside as unfertile. Whether we do or do not assent to his special philosophy of the transcendent element in our Lord, at least he has deepened our feeling for the mystery of personality, and it cannot be seriously questioned that this is the first essential for a Christology that is to win or satisfy the modern mind.

In the Study.

Freely.

I.

The Use of the Word.

THIS word is used in the English Bible in three ways. It means—

I. *Without restraint.*

- S. Augustine's *Manuell*, 1577 (Pickering's ed., p. 20): 'Happy is the soule whiche being let loose from the earthly prison, flieth up freely into heauen, and there beholdeth thee her most sweete Lord face to face.'

Gn 2¹⁶—'Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat.'

Ad. Est. 16¹⁰—'The Jews may live freely after their own laws.'

Ac 2²⁹—'Let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David.' The Greek here is *μετὰ παρρησίας*, lit. 'with boldness of speech.'

Ac 26²⁶—'Before whom also I speak freely.' The Greek is *παρρησιαζόμενος λαλῶ*: the same Greek participle is translated in 9²⁸ 'preaching boldly.'

Jn 2¹⁰ R.V.—'When men have drunk freely' This translation of the R.V. is a compromise

between the translation of the A.V., 'when men have well drunk' (which comes from the Geneva Bible, and is used also in the Bishops' and the Rhemish Versions), and the literal translation, 'when men are drunken' (cf. Lk 12⁴⁵), which is used by Tindale, followed by Coverdale, Rogers, and the Great Bible (cf. Vulg. *cum inebriati fuerint*).

2. Of free will, voluntarily.

Milton, *Paradise Lost*, v. 538—

Freely we serve
Because we freely love.

Ps 54⁶—"I will freely sacrifice unto thee"—lit. 'with voluntariness'; but as the same word is used for a freewill offering, R.V. translates, 'With a freewill offering will I sacrifice unto thee.'

Hos 14⁴—"I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely." Some of the translations here are interesting. The Vulg. has *spontanee*, the Wyclifte Version of 1382 'of my free will,' but 1388, 'wilfuli'; Rogers, 'wyth al my heart'; Douay, 'voluntarily.' 'Freely' comes from the Geneva Version. The Hebrew is simply the word 'voluntariness' (*nedhabhak*): it is the same word that is translated 'willing' in Ps 110³, lit. 'Thy people will be (all) voluntariness in the day of thy host' (*i.e.* be ready to volunteer for service).

In the Geneva Version (of Lk 1²⁸) the participle *κεχαριτωμένη* is translated 'Hail thou that art freely beloved.' Upon which there is an angry note in the Rhemish Version. There the translation is 'full of grace,' which is Wyclif's and Tindale's. 'Note,' say the translators, 'the excellent prerogatives of our B. Lady, and abhorre those Heretikes which make her no better than other vulgar women, and therefore to take from her fulnes of grace, they say here, "Haile freely beloved," contrarie to al significations of the Greeke worde, which is at the lest, "endued with grace," as S. Paul vseth it Ephes 1 by S. Chrysostom's interpretation: or rather, "ful of grace," as both Greek and Latin fathers haue alwaies here vnderstood it, and the Latines also read it, namely, S. Ambrose, thus, "Wel is she only called ful of grace, who only obtained the grace, which no other woman deserved, to be replenished with the author of grace."'

3. For nothing, gratuitously.

Wyclif (1388), Ex 21¹¹, 'sche schal go out freli (1382, frelich) without money.'

Coverdale (1535), Is 52⁵, 'my people is frely caried away,' where A.V. and R.V. have 'my people is taken away for nought.'

The usual word in the N.T. is *δωρεάν*, which is the accus. of the word *δωρεά* meaning 'a gift' used adverbially. This is so in Mt 10⁸, Ro 3²⁴, 2 Co 11⁷, Rev 21⁶ 22¹⁷. In Ro 8³² and 1 Co 2¹² it is the verb *χαρίζομαι* which is translated 'freely give.' But the meaning is the same, 'without money and without price.'

In the *Judgment of the Synod of Dort*, we read, 'Faith in Jesus Christ, and saluation through him is the free gift of God, as it is written, Eph 2⁸, "By grace yee are saued, through faith, and that not of your selues, it is the gift of God";' in like manner, Phil 1²⁹, 'Vnto you it is (freely) giuen to beleuee in Christ.'

II.

The Chief Texts.

The chief texts are Hos 14⁴, Ro 3²⁴, Rev 21⁶ with 22¹⁷, Ro 8³², Mt 10⁸.

Hos 14⁴—"I will love them freely." This text is the beginning. It must be the beginning, for it is the beginning of everything. From the love of God comes life, with all that life brings us. From the love of God comes death, and the resurrection from the dead, and life everlasting. From the love of God comes our appreciation of all these things, our appreciation of the Giver of them. We love because He first loved us.

This sentence, says Spurgeon,¹ is a body of divinity in miniature. He who understands its meaning is a theologian, and he who can dive into its fulness is a true Master in divinity. 'I will love them freely,' is a condensation of the glorious message of salvation which was delivered to us in Christ Jesus our Redeemer. The sense hinges upon the word 'freely.' 'I will love them freely.' Here is the glorious, the suitable, the divine way by which love streams from heaven to earth. It is, indeed, the only way in which God can love such as we are. It may be that He can love angels because of their goodness; but He could not love *us* for that reason; the only manner in which love can come from God to fallen creatures is expressed in the word 'freely.' Here we have spontaneous love flowing forth to those who neither deserved it, purchased it, nor sought after it.

Ro 3²⁴—"Being justified freely by his grace." This is the love of God in action—the free, spontaneous, undeserved, unasked love of God, acting upon us so lovingly that through Christ we are declared to be no longer enemies, but fellow-citizens with

¹ *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, No. 501, p. 169.

the saints. Being justified, we love, because He first loved us; and we love one another according to the measure of His love to us in Christ—if not yet in actual fact, at least in prospect, the way being now made open. And this active exercise of His love in our justification is as undeserved as His original gift of love.

Matthew Henry very properly emphasizes the word 'freely.' "The apostle says that the justification is "freely by his grace" to show that it must be understood of grace in the most proper and genuine sense. It is said that Joseph found grace in the sight of his master (Gn 39⁴), but there was a reason; he saw that what he did prospered. There was something in Joseph to invite that grace; but the grace of God communicated to us comes freely, freely; it is free grace, mere mercy; nothing in us to deserve such favours; no, it is all "through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." It comes freely to us, but Christ bought it, and paid dear for it, which yet is so ordered as not to derogate from the honour of free grace. Christ's purchase is no bar to the freeness of God's grace; for grace provided and accepted this vicarious satisfaction."

Rev 21⁶.—"I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely." Being justified freely by His grace we have entered upon the journey of life, the journey which ends in that city which hath foundations. But every step of the way we receive freely of His grace. And the grace which is given us is well symbolized by a fountain of the water of life. For every step of the way we are thirsty, and at every step our thirst is quenched in Him. The first step first, of course.

I heard the voice of Jesus say,
 'Behold, I freely give
 The living water; thirsty one,
 Stoop down and drink, and live':
 I came to Jesus, and I drank
 Of that life-giving stream;
 My thirst was quenched, my soul revived,
 And now I live in Him.

But also every following step. And these steps are (1) pardon, (2) purity, (3) peace, (4) presence, and then no more thirst.

Over the silver mountains,
 Where spring the nectar fountains,
 There will I kiss
 The bowls of bliss,
 And drink mine everlasting fill
 From every milken rill;
 My soul will be a-dry before,
 But after that will thirst no more.

God issues many invitations of the freest kind. I will only quote one out of very many. Turn to the first verse of the fifty-fifth chapter of Isaiah, 'Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.' Grace must be gratis; the word 'freely' in our text makes it clear that salvation is an absolute gift, but here the fact is put in a negative form that there may be no mistake whatever. Mercy is 'without money and without price'—without price in any possible sense. We neither purchase, nor procure, nor earn, nor produce salvation by merit, effort, sacrifice, or service. It comes to us, not because we deserve it, but because we need it. We are blessed with it out of the goodwill and pleasure of the Lord, and we do not purchase it by good deeds, good desires, or pious resolves, or persevering endeavours. We are empty and He fills us. In order that you may come to Jesus, no preparation is required. You may come just as you are, and come at once: only confess that you need Him, desire to have Him, and then take Him by trusting Him. He is like wine and milk, supplying delight and satisfaction, and you are to take Him as men would take a drink. How could the invitation be put more broadly than it is? How could it be uttered more earnestly? It has a 'Ho!' to give it tongue. Tradesmen in certain parts of London stand outside of their shops and cry 'Buy, buy!' or call out 'Ho!' to the passers-by because they are anxious to sell their wares. Jesus is yet more eager to distribute His rich grace, for He longs to see men saved. Ho! ye that pass by, stop here awhile: turn your attention this way: here is something worthy of your thoughts. 'Ho! every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money.'¹

Ro 8³².—"He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not also with him freely give us all things?" This is not the gift of the water of life in other language. The water of life signifies that we freely receive all things that are necessary to quench our thirst. But now we see that when we receive Christ we receive many things of the need of which we were before quite unconscious, and of the value of which we were quite ignorant. All things are ours, whether Paul or Apollos or Cephas, or the world or life or death, or things present or things to come. The range of our possessions vastly exceeds our sense of need. He gives us what we need freely, and as we need it; but just as freely He gives us innumerable things which we do not know we need. Nor is there any occasion for incredulity. For in comparison with the gift of Christ, all other things, if we could separate them from Him, would be of little account. But it is with Christ we receive them. To receive Him is to receive them all.

¹ C. H. Spurgeon, *Metropolitan Tabernacle Pulpit*, No. 1549, p. 415.

All things in Christ are *freely* for all. 'Shall He not with Him also freely give us all things?' It is not God's way to sell His glorious things. It is not His way in nature. The vital things of nature, the manifold riches of sea and shore, of earth and sky, are free gifts. We often reason as if we had paid handsomely for all things, and then grumble as if we had got short measure; but it is the greatest possible blunder. If we reject free gifts, we must send back every beam of the sun, every drop of rain and flake of snow, every green leaf, every spray of blossom, every purple cluster, every golden sheaf. Neither does God sell His glorious gifts of intellect. There was no king's ransom ready in the house where Shakespeare was born. All may see that Heaven does not dispense its most splendid talents where wealth is, or greatness; the immortal painter, singer, or inventor is born in attic, cellar, or cottage into which no other royalty ever looked. And God does not sell anything that belongs to the realm of the soul. The principle of barter has no place in the highest world. If we thought to purchase the noblest things with silver or gold, with gifts or sacrifices, we are sternly reprov'd: 'Thy money,' thy goods, thy goodness, 'perish with thee.' And as it is not God's way to sell His glorious things to pride and greatness, we certainly have no ability to buy them. All is, must be, free.¹

Mt 10⁸—'Freely ye received, freely give. The words were spoken to the Twelve when He sent them out to preach. He sends us all out to preach, if we interpret the mission broadly enough. He Himself gave it a broad interpretation to the disciples: 'As ye go, preach, saying, The kingdom of heaven is at hand; heal the sick, raise the dead, cleanse the lepers, cast out devils; freely ye received, freely give.' Their orders were, in short, to give everything that they had to give. But special emphasis is laid on the manner of giving. It is to be without thought of return. The disciples are to begin the giving as God began the loving; and they are to continue it with as little regard to the worthiness of the recipients. Moreover, they are to hope for nothing again except the one thing, love; and even that, not love to them, but love to God.

Once when I was a schoolboy going home for the holidays, I had a long way to go to reach the far-away little town in which I dwelt. I arrived at Bristol, and got on board the steamer with just money enough to pay my fare, and that being settled, I thought in my innocence I had paid for everything I needed in the way of meals. I had what I wanted so long as we were in smooth water; then came the rough Atlantic, and the need of nothing more. I had been lying in my berth for hours, wretchedly ill, and past caring for anything, when there came the steward and stood beside me.

'Your bill, sir,' said he, holding out the piece of paper. — 'I've got no money,' said I in my wretchedness. 'Then I shall keep your luggage. What is your name and address?'

I told him. Instantly he took off the cap he wore, with the gilt-band about it, and held out his hand: 'I should like to shake hands with you,' he said, with a smile.

I gave him my hand, and shook his as well as I could. Then came the explanation—how that some years before some little kindness had been shown his mother by my father in the sorrow of her widowhood. 'I never thought the chance would come for me to repay it,' said he pleasantly; 'but I am glad it has.'

'So am I,' said I.

As soon as I got ashore I told my father what had happened. 'Ah,' said he, 'see how a bit of kindness lives! Now he has passed it on to you. Remember, if ever you meet anybody that needs a friendly hand, you must pass it on to them.'

Years had gone by. I had grown up and quite forgotten it all, until one day I had gone to the station of one of our main lines. I was just going to take my ticket when I saw a little lad crying—a thorough man he was, trying bravely to keep back the troublesome tears, as he pleaded with the booking-clerk.

'What is the matter, my lad?' I asked.

'If you please, sir, I haven't money enough to pay my fare. I have all I want but a few pence, and I tell the clerk if he will trust me I will be sure to pay him again.'

Instantly back upon me flashed the forgotten story of long ago. Here, then, was my chance of passing it on. I gave him the sum he needed, and got into the carriage with him. Then I told the little fellow the story of long ago, and of the steward's kindness to me. 'Now, to-day,' I said, 'I pass it on to you; and remember if you meet with any one that needs a kindly hand, you must pass it on to them.'

'I will, sir,' cried the lad, as he took my hand, and his eyes flashed with earnestness.

'I am sure you will,' I answered.

I reached my destination, and left my little friend. The last sign I had of him was as the handkerchief fluttered from the window of the carriage, as if to say: 'It is all right, sir; I will pass it on.'²

Virginitibus Puerisque.

Happiness.

There are twenty-six letters in the English alphabet, and the Rev. S. P. Bevan has published twenty-six *Talks to Girls and Boys* (Griffiths; 2s. 6d. net). The first talk is on Angels, the second on Bells, the third on Conscience, and so on, till the alphabet is ended. H is for Happiness. This is Mr. Bevan's talk on Happiness:

What is Happiness?

A Yorkshire man said that there is happiness in 'Having a little bit more than you've got.' Here

² M. G. Pearse, *Some Aspects of the Blessed Life*, 161.

¹ W. L. Watkinson, *Studies in Christian Character*, 2nd ser. II.

is a description of Happiness that won a prize: 'Happiness is wanting nothing and knowing it.' For ourselves we will say: Happiness is health of heart.

The first division of our little sermon shall be:

(a) *Happiness is inside of you.*

'Oh!' a boy says, 'how glad I should be, how happy, if father would buy me a cricket bat—one with a proper cane-splice.' 'Oh!' another says, 'I should be happy if my father would buy me a watch. All for my own.' 'Yes,' a girl says, 'if I could only have a pair of boots like those in that shop, or a ribbon like Lucy's, I should be quite happy.' Don't, don't grow up with the idea that happiness is in the things you can buy for your own. A man who had three millions every year was not happy, and a famous German who had many beautiful things and was very clever, said that in all his seventy-five years he had not had one month of true happiness.

Can you learn these lines:

In your hearts are the birds and the sunshine,
In your thoughts the brooklets flow.

Happiness is inside of you.

The second division is:

(b) *To keep happiness you must give it away.*

'Oh no! that can't be right'—yes—it is. Byron said that happiness was born a twin—by

which he meant that if you would keep happiness you must halve it.

Once upon a time there lived a king, who had one son. This boy had everything he wished for—toys of many kinds—a fine yacht to steam round the palace lake—a pony (my!—wouldn't you like to have a pony?), and I don't know what besides, and yet he was unhappy. With sad eyes he used to wander about the palace and the park. The king—his father—was troubled, and went to see a wise old man, and said, 'Can you tell me how it is that my son is not happy? I buy him all he wants: he has friends, toys, a yacht, a pony, and yet he is miserable.'

The wise old man took a piece of paper and wrote on it, with something that looked like water. Folding the paper he gave it to the king, saying, 'At eight o'clock to-night, when it will be dark, take a lighted candle and hold this paper between the light and your eyes, and you will then read what I have written, in ink that looked like water.' Evening came, and, in a large room of the palace, the king held the paper before a lighted candle. Out upon the paper there came, clearly, these words, 'The secret of happiness is to do a little kindness to someone every day.' If you would keep happiness you must give it away.

'If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them.' That is the text.

On Maps of Palestine containing Ancient Sites.

BY THE REV. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

II.

JAZER (Is 16⁸)—properly *Ya'zer*—is mentioned several times besides in the Old Testament; but not in such a way as to fix its site precisely. It belonged to Gad (Nu 32³⁵, Jos 13²⁵, 12 S 24⁵²), and was on the border of the Ammonites (Nu 21²⁴,—at least if, as is probable, *Ya'zer* (עֶזֶר) should be read for *strong* (עַז); see Gray, *Numbers*, p. 297).

¹ Where 'their border was,' means 'their territory included.'

² Read with LXX 'began from' for 'pitched in'; and render then, with RVm, 'toward' for the ungrammatical 'of.'

The map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, follow the P.E.F. map, mentioned in the last article, in placing Jazer about 16 miles E.N.E. of the N.E. corner of the Dead Sea, a little N.E. of el-'Al (Ele'aleh, Is 16⁹); G. A. Smith does not venture to locate it. Why is Jazer placed so confidently here? The *Survey of E. Palestine* (p. 91) will inform us. Simply because there is a place there called 'Beit-zera'; and the consonants in *zera'* are the same as three of those in *Ya'zer*, only 'transposed, as in other cases, so as to give a modern meaning

to the word.' The reason is hardly more satisfactory than that for the identification of Heisa with Luḥith. Eusebius, indeed, tells us (264. 98-265. 5) that Yazer was a town, 10 or (212. 27) 8 Roman miles W. of Philadelphia (Rabbath Ammon, now 'Ammān), and 15 R. miles from Heshbon: a large stream, he adds, rose from it, and fell into the Jordan. These distances would point to a place, a little W. of Ajbēhāt (the ancient Jogbehah), in the W. Ezrak (see G. A. Smith's map), some 14 miles N. of Beit-zera'. The *Onomasticon*, however, 'is not a safe guide': but there ought surely to be better grounds for rejecting its testimony than those alleged in the present instance. It is true, however, that Eusebius' statement does occasion some difficulty. There does not seem to be in W. Ezrak, at least so far as it has been explored, any ruins or modern place that would satisfy Eusebius' description. Hence Merrill and others¹ have identified Ya'zer with Šār,—to judge from the ruins, a place anciently of some importance,—7 miles W. of 'Ammān, and 10 miles due N. of Heshbon (see Smith's map; and a description in Merrill's art. JAZER in *D.B.*). Šār stands on a hill: in the valley below, about 1 mile to the N.W., is the spring 'Ain eṣ-Šir, the waters of which combine with those of a number of streams flowing down from the N. and N.W. to form the Wādy Šir, which runs down through a well-watered, beautifully wooded valley to the S.W.; on the S. of Šār, other streams arise to form the Wādy esh-Shita, which, also flowing down to the S.W., soon becomes the Wādy Bahhath: this, before long, unites with W. Šir to form W. Kefrein, a large stream which ultimately falls into the Jordan, about 2 miles N. of the Dead Sea.² The distances of Šār from 'Ammān and Heshbon are not much less than those given by Eusebius for Ja'zer; and one of the streams just described might be very fairly identified with the one mentioned by him: but, as already pointed out in the *Survey* (p. 153f.), the names Šār and Ya'zer can have no connexion; and the phonetic differences between them constitute a fatal objection to their identification.³

¹ The identification, I believe, was first proposed by Seetzen, *Reisen*, 1854, i. 398 (either Šir, or Kh. eṣ-Šireh, above 'Ain eṣ-Šir, to the N.W.).

² See, for the particulars, Merrill, *East of Jordan*, pp. 405-7; the P.E.F. *Survey of E. Palestine*, p. 153, with the map in the pocket; and Guy Le Strange, in Schumacher's *Across the Jordan*, p. 311, 312.

³ Kampffmeyer (*Z.D.P.V.* xv. (1892), 24; cf. xvi. 43,

Still, as Dr. Gray remarks (*Numbers*, p. 298), the 'site of Šār does tolerably suit the data of Eusebius'; if, therefore, it is adopted provisionally,—pending a more thorough exploration of W. Ezrak,—it must be clearly understood that the identification is *conjectural*, and that it is made, not *because of* the resemblance of 'Šār' to 'Ya'zer,' but *in spite of* there being no real connexion between them. It ought thus in no case to be marked on a map without a (?). Laurence Oliphant, in his *Land of Gilead*, 1880 (p. 233), observing that Jajuz, the name of a place 5 miles N. of 'Ammān, 'seems to have a certain similarity (!) with Jazer,' proposes this as its site. But this identification has nothing to recommend it. It is true, there appear to be a spring and stream sufficiently near to satisfy Eusebius' statements: but the stream flows, not into the Jordan, but into the Jabbok; the distances are altogether different from those given by Eusebius, and the name resembles Ja'zer as little as Šār does. Indeed, Oliphant himself thinks that if it will not do for Ja'zer, it will at least suit Jahaz! But we cannot identify two names merely because they both begin with *Ja* and have a *z* in them.

Let us now take some examples from the other side of Jordan. Let us suppose that the intelligent reader desires to find the places assigned in Jos 15⁸³⁻⁸⁶ to the *shephēlah*, or 'lowland,' of Judah; and let us see what help his maps give him.

1 and 2. 'Eshta'ol and Zor'ah. The name Zor'ah is still preserved in *Zur'a*, a place 14 miles due W. of Jerusalem: so there is no difficulty about its site. Eshta'ol is often mentioned beside it in the history of Samson; and though 'Eshua', the name of a place about a mile N.E. of it, is 'far in sound from אֶשְׁתָּאֹל' (G. A. Smith, *H.G.* 218 n.), yet the situation suits. Still, one certainly wishes that the 'tradition' that the place was once called 'Eshu'al or 'Eshu'al (Smith, 219; Buhl, 195) could be confirmed. The site is accepted in *H.G.* 218 only with 'perhaps.'

3. 'Ashnah. In the P.E.F. map, mentioned

referred to by Buhl), in one of his interesting and scholarly articles on the ancient place-names of Palestine, compared phonetically with their modern equivalents, says that he has in his collections no instance of the change of י into ש, except in the equally uncertain case of the suggested identification of *Muraṣṣaṣ* with Meroz. (Ewing, in accepting this in *D.B.*, *s.v.*, is obviously unconscious of any phonetic difficulty; Moore's objections are thus better 'justified' than he imagines.)

above, marked with a (?) at the village of Ḥasan, about a mile N. of Zor'ah. In G. A. Smith's map (both the one of Judah in *H.G.*, and the large map), the map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, placed at Ḥasan *without* a (?).

But according to the article in *D.B.* (Conder), *E.B.*, and Steuernagel, in his Comm. on Jos. (1900), unidentified; and by G. A. Smith, *H.G.* 202 n. 1, included (implicitly) among the sites 'not properly identified.' And when we learn (P.E.F. *Name-Lists*, p. 305) that 'Ḥasan' commemorates the name of an Arab pilgrim, it dawns upon us that Smith's statement is not in excess of the truth.

In the case of this place, there are thus two contradictions, each in one and the same book: in both *H.G.* and *D.B.* the map marks it, without any indication of uncertainty; the text says that the site is unknown!

4. Zanoah; no doubt *Zanu'*, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles S. of Zor'ah. On the ξ for π see Kampffmeyer, xv. 25 f.

5. 'En-gannim. *D.B.* and *E.B.* both state that it was identified by Clermont-Ganneau¹ with *Umm-Jinā*, 2 miles S.W. of Zor'ah, but without apparently endorsing the identification. It 'might perhaps be' Umm-Jinā, says Buhl (p. 194 f.). Placed there in the P.E.F. map, G. A. Smith's map, and Murray's map. In the map of Judah in *E.B.* marked there also, but (N.B.) with (??) attached. Any one who reads Clermont-Ganneau's own discussion of the site must surely see that the grounds for the identification are very conjectural. Whatever *Jinā* may mean (Clermont-Ganneau says the *jinns*), it has no connexion with *gannim* (gardens).

6. Tappuah. Site unknown (Armstrong, Steuernagel, and Wilson, in *D.B.*, s.v.), and not marked on the maps. Said in *H.G.* 202 n. 1 to be in the W. el-'Afranġ. But is not the *Tuffuh* in this valley, 4 miles W. of Hebron, rather the Beth-tappuah of Jos 15⁵⁸, in the 'hill-country'?

7. 'Enām. Placed in P.E.F. map, with a (?), at *Khurbet W. 'Alin*, or the Ruins of Wady 'Alin, 2 miles slightly W. of N. of Zanoah.² Located here by Conder in *Handbook to the Bible* (1879), p. 410. But in Murray's *Dict. of the Bible* (1909), the same writer locates it in an entirely different situation, at 'Kefr 'Ana, 6 miles N.W. of Sorek,'

¹ *Archaeol. Researches in Palestine* (P.E.F.) ii. 207 f.

² In either both the 1 in. and $\frac{3}{8}$ in. to the mile maps of Palestine, or in G. A. Smith's map, Zanoah must be incorrectly located; in the former it is slightly East of S. of Kh. W. 'Alin, in the latter it is considerably West of S. of it.

and 7 miles W.N.W. of Zor'ah; and in *D.B.* iii. 648, at *Ain 'Ainah* (which I cannot find). Placed at Kh. W. 'Alin, but *without* the (?), in the map of Judah in *H.G.*, in Murray's map, and in the *D.B.* map. But in the text of *H.G.* 202 n. 'Enām is said to be 'not properly identified,' and it is omitted in Smith's large wall-map. Steuernagel says that the site is unknown. In *D.B.* and *E.B.*, s.v., nothing more definite is said than that (see Gn 38¹⁴) 'Enām was between 'Adullam and the Timnah of Gn 38¹³. This, however, will have been (notice *went up*, *goeth up*, in Gn 28^{12, 13}) the Timnah (now *Tibna*),³ 4 miles N.E. of 'Aid el-mâ, and 5 miles S.E. of Kh. Wady 'Alin; so that, if this be 'Enām, and (see below) 'Aid el-mâ 'Adullam, it will have been anything but 'between' 'Adullam and Timnah. The uncertainty in the site of 'Enām must be obvious. Yet the maps in *H.G.* and *D.B.*, and Murray's map, all mark it as certain.

8. Yarmuth. No doubt *Yarmuk*, 1 mile S. of Zanoah. Cf., on the *k*, Kampffmeyer, xvi. 2, 45.

9. 'Adullam. Clermont-Ganneau in 1871 discovered, 4 miles S.E. of Yarmuk, a ruined site called 'Aid el-mâ, which he conjectured to represent the Biblical 'Adullam—the ancient name having been transformed by a 'popular etymology' (Buhl, 193; *P.E.F.Q.St.* 1875, 177). The identification is conjectural, but the situation would suit; and it has been generally accepted. But it ought not to be marked on a map without a (?). It is not marked at all in the map of Judah in *E.B.* Cf. *H.G.* 229 f.

10. Socoh. No doubt 'esh-Shurweike—a diminutive form (Kampffmeyer, xvi. 2, 66)—2 miles S. of Yarmuk.

11. 'Azēkah. Not in the P.E.F. map. In G. A. Smith's map, *D.B.* map, and Murray's map, marked at *Zakariyā*, 2 miles S.W. of Zanoah. But in *D.B.*, s.v. (Conder), no identification is proposed; and *H.G.* 202 n. says, 'not properly identified.' We have thus two other instances of the text and the map in one and the same volume contradicting each other.

12. Sha'araim. Placed in P.E.F. map, with a (?), at the ruined site *Sha'ireh*, $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles E.S.E. of Zanoah. In the map in *D.B.*, and Murray's map, marked at *Sha'ireh*, but *without* the (?). Not marked in either of G. A. Smith's maps; and according to *H.G.* 202 n. 'not properly identified.' In *D.B.*, s.v. (Wilson), no identification accepted.

³ And not the Timnah of Samson (Jg 14¹, etc.), which was 4 miles W. of Kh. W. 'Alin, and far lower than 'Aid el-mâ.

13. 'Adithaim. Unknown (*D.B.*, *E.B.*), and, so far as I can discover, not shown on the maps. In the P.E.F. *Memoirs*, ii. (1882) 322, identified by Conder with *Ḥaditheh*, 3 miles E. of Lydda; but in *D.B.* i. (1898), *s.v.*, the same writer says that the site is unknown! The contradiction, like those in regard to 'Enām, throws light on the value of some of these supposed 'identifications.'

14. Gedērah. Marked in the P.E.F. map, G. A. Smith's map, Murray's map, and *D.B.* map at *Jedireh*, $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles N.N.W. of Zor'ah. This seems much more probable than the more distant *Kutra*—which, moreover, does not agree phonetically¹—13 miles W.N.W. of Zor'ah, in the maritime plain, apparently preferred in *E.B.*

15. Gedērothaim. The subscription mentions only *fourteen* cities, so no doubt there is here some textual error. The name may, for instance, be a corrupt repetition of *Gedērah*, or an error for גִּדְרֹתַיִם (LXX), 'its sheep-folds.'

A map in which, out of fourteen names taken at random, the sites of five are in the highest degree questionable and uncertain, cannot be said to attain a high standard of accuracy. I have often, besides, also noticed sites confidently assigned on the current maps of Palestine, which, upon looking into the grounds upon which they rest, I have found to be equally problematical: in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xviii. 332 f., I gave a list of nearly thirty such sites of places mentioned in the Book of Judges.² I have little doubt that many other equally doubtful sites could be found. A map ought to be trustworthy: it is of little real use if no less well-known site marked upon it can be relied upon until hours have been spent in searching out the grounds on which it depends, and ascertaining whether they are sufficient. The only English maps of Palestine which, so far as I have examined them, can be implicitly relied upon are those in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*. If I may say

¹ The equation, writes Kampffmeyer, *Z.D.M.G.* xvi. (1893) p. 31, is 'recht zweifelhaft.'

² The rock of 'Eṭām (Jg 15⁸), for instance, was a place to which Samson 'went down' from Timnah (v.⁶; cf. 14¹⁻⁵); but Beit-'Aṭab, 5 miles E. of Zanoah, the favourite site for 'Eṭām on the maps (but not in the map in *H.G.*, and in the wall-map only with a ?) is some 1200 feet *above* it! (cf. *H.G.* 222). The ups and downs of the Shephēlah country are vividly reflected in the stories of Samson; and here, as elsewhere in the O.T., the 'went up' and 'came down' should always be carefully noted by the reader. Cf. *H.G.* chap. x.

so without presumption, even G. A. Smith's map needs some revision; Murray's map and the *D.B.* map need not revision merely, but drastic expurgation. These maps are admirably designed and engraved; but what chartographer, however skilful he may be in the technique of his own profession, can estimate the grounds—philological, critical, historical, or exegetical—upon which, in cases where the *name* has not been unambiguously preserved, the probability of a proposed identification depends? It is to be feared that the authorities of the P.E.F. are responsible in some measure for the confusion; and that the map-makers who have adopted their identifications have not sufficiently considered that, however highly qualified a man may be to survey and describe a *modern* country, he is not on this account equally qualified to estimate the grounds for the identification of a given modern site with an *ancient* place. And when Murray's map and the *D.B.* map are both stated to be 'according to Palestine Exploration Survey,' this is incorrect, and asserts for the map an authority which it does not possess. All that the 'Palestine Exploration Survey' has done is to determine the configuration and sites of the *modern country*,—and, as every one knows, it has done this work most admirably; but it is no function of a 'survey' to determine what *ancient* places any of these sites represent. In some cases the identity of the modern with the ancient site depends upon a well-established, continuous historical tradition; in other cases it depends upon a probable, or, it may be, a very improbable, conjecture; but in none of these cases is the identity, whether real or imaginary, a matter which falls within the scope of a 'survey'; and the confidence which the details of the 'survey' rightly command cannot be claimed for the many hypothetical, and often questionable, identifications with which these maps are crowded. There are cases, also, as noticed above, in which these maps do the P.E.F. map the injustice of adopting from it ancient sites *without* the (?) by which the compilers of that map have guarded themselves. This is a practice deserving strong reprobation. It surely must be evident that for the construction of a map of Palestine including ancient sites, the professional map-maker needs a competent scholar at his side, to advise him what proposed 'identifications' deserve to be accepted by him. Murray's map is a convenient one, as it is handy in size, and shows the elevations (which are important for the history);

but it is full of pitfalls for the unwary, and must always be used with extreme caution. The map in Buhl's *Geographie* (1896) contains, unfortunately, only modern sites. A critical map of Palestine, on a convenient scale, and containing only those

ancient sites which are either certain or reasonably probable, is still, as it was in 1892 (*THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, xiii. 460), a desideratum of Biblical students. Let us hope that some adequately qualified scholar will come forward and produce it.

Contributions and Comments.

The Muhammadan 'Corner.'

ALTHOUGH the word 'corner' in the commercial sense is of United States origin, the thing which it denotes is of immemorial antiquity. A primitive example of it which will occur to every one is that of Joseph in Egypt. In the East this operation is confined to foodstuffs, the demand for other commodities not being sufficiently stringent, and it is forbidden by the law of Islām. It is thus defined in the *Tenbih al-Ghāfilin* (*Warning to the Negligent*) of Samarqandi (d. 1003 A.D.):

'Cornering (*hukrah*) means buying provisions in a town and holding them without selling, although the people require them. This is to form a corner, and it is forbidden. But if the grain be the produce of one's own estate, or be imported from another town, this is not a corner. Still, if public necessity require it, the grain must be sold. Should the owner refuse to sell he becomes guilty of evil intention towards the Muslims and of want of consideration for them. He must then be forced to sell, and if he refuse he must be scourged and punished, and even then he may not sell at his own price, but at the market rate. For even the Apostle of God said, I do not fix prices, but he who fixes prices is God.'

This regulation is founded on traditional sayings of Muhammad such as the following:—He who makes a corner in grain is a sinner: He who corners foodstuffs for a period of forty days has done with God, and God has done with him: The importer shall be blessed, but the cornerer is cursed,—the 'importer' being defined as the merchant who purchases foodstuffs with the intention of selling them, and imports them to his own locality and sells them. Muhammad is also reported to have warned one of his disciples not to apprentice his son to a grain merchant, on the ground that it were better for him to meet death

whilst engaged in drinking wine, or in some other crime, than to meet it just after he happened to have cornered grain for forty nights. Malik ibn Anas (d. 795 A.D.) mentions in the *Muwatta* that Omar and Othmān, the second and third khalifs, also prohibited corners in food.

These recommendations of Muhammad and his followers were far from remaining a dead letter. One of the officials of the Muslim municipality is the *moh̄tasib*, whose duty it is to regulate the price of commodities, and in times of scarcity to find out hidden stores of grain and bring them to the market. The Egyptian Government frequently imported corn from Syria to counteract the effects of a low Nile, and if that failed to bring down prices, the grain speculators were flogged until they sold their supplies at the government rate. The *moh̄tasib* himself, however, was sometimes interested in the trade. This was the case at Medina when Burckhardt visited it (*Travels in Arabia*, vol. ii. p. 248 f.). The whole subject is treated in the *Hedaya* of Marghināni (d. 1197 A.H.), English translation by Charles Hamilton, 2nd ed. p. 605 ff.

T. H. WEIR.

Glasgow.

Stephen Langton's Death.

I.

I WROTE *re* this query to my friend the Rev. Charles Woodruff, at the Dean and Chapter Library, Canterbury, who replies this morning: 'I don't know that I shall be able to settle the question as to the date of Archbishop Langton's death from our records. The Monastic Registers do not begin so early as 1228, though we have any number of earlier charters, and of course it might be possible to fix the date from them, though it may take time to find out.'

RICHARD COOKE.

Maidstone.

II.

Dr. Nestle's question is anticipated by Miss Kate Norgate—than whom no better authority—in *Dict. Nat. Biog.* xxxii., s.v. LANGTON (STEPHEN): 'The dates of his death and burial are given by the chroniclers of the time in a strangely conflicting and self-contradictory way; the most probable solution of the puzzle seems to be that he died on 9th July 1228, and was buried on 15th at Canterbury.'

C. S. WARD.

Bury St. Edmunds.

An Englishman.

As the author of one of the books in Messrs. Morgan & Scott's 'Missionary Series,' I should like to thank you for your reference in the current number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 512. Your reviewer is, however, misinformed when he states that I am an American. I have great admiration for that virile nation, but confess that I prefer to remain what I am—an Englishman. In writing my book, *Christ the Desire of Nations*, I found great stimulus and help from articles in the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE, and DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS, as well as THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

EDGAR W. DAVIS.

Banbury.

The Coat without Seam.

I.

DR. NESTLE says that he has looked in vain in the DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE for some elucidation of the seamless robe. But the garment is discussed and illustrated in article DRESS, i. 625. And reference to that article is made under COAT and under CLOKE in the Index.

H. S. MARWICK.

II.

Dr. Nestle's interpretation of the coat without seam from the top, which he fails to find elsewhere, is in Luthardt's Commentary, 'ὁ χιτῶν, the shirt-like undergarment, was ἄραφος, without seam from above, that is, from the opening for the neck.'

GEO. A. DERRY.

The Palace, Derry.

Chronology of the Old Testament in the English Bible.

IN the article 'Chronology of the Old Testament' (*D.B.* i. 398), I find a lacuna.

Think of a Bible reader who uses one of the many editions of the A.V., which give on the margins the years B.C. If he compares them with the tables in that article, what does he find?

	A.V.	D.B.	Result.
1. Years from the Creation to the Flood .	4004-2348 = 1656	1656	=
2. From Flood to Birth of Abraham .	2348-1996 = 352	290 + 62	
3. From the Birth of Abraham to Exodus	1996-1491 = 505	720 - 215	
4. Total from the Creation to Exodus .	4004-1491 = 2513	2666 - 153	

How are these differences to be explained? That they are not explained, not even mentioned, in the said article seems to me the lacuna.

The differences come from three places:

(a) From Gn 10¹⁰ 'Shem was 100 years old and begat Arphaxad 2 years after the flood.' These 2 years are not reckoned in the *D.B.*; attention, however, is called to them in the footnote of p. 398a.

(b) From the internal inconsistency between Gn 11²⁶ and 12⁴. The article of the *D.B.* reckons from the birth of Terah to the entrance of Abraham into Canaan—

70 + 75 years .	145
The A.V. 130 + 75 „ .	205
making a plus of 60.	

(c) The sojourn in Egypt is reckoned in the *D.B.* at 430, in the A.V. at 215 years, making a minus of 215.

Thus we have + 2 + 60 - 215 = - 153.

A word, too, might have been said in that article on the origin of the chronological figures in the A.V. In the art. 'English Versions' (Extra Vol. p. 257) it is shortly mentioned that dates were for the first time added in the margin in the folio of 1701, revised by Bishop Lloyd, 'taken in the main from Ussher.' As Scrivener in his *Introduction to the Paragraph Bible* informs us: 'Bp. Lloyd's dates have not been materially tampered with, since they were first brought into our Bible, though in some copies they are repeated more frequently than in others.' Scrivener gives there some examples of changed figures. Zech (chap. 9),

for instance, was attributed by Lloyd to 587, since 1836 to 517, in Bagster's edition of 1846 to 510, in the American edition of 1867 to 487. Scrivener himself puts a mark of interrogation to this and some other questionable dates, and adds a few dates in brackets, as '[B.C. 177]' at Est 11¹.

It seems to me a pity that even such editions of the A.V. as increased the passages to which dates are given, for instance, the Variorum Bible, show in another respect a painful *capiti diminutio*; all figures referring to the reckoning of the Septuagint are left out in the first six books. At Gn 1¹, for instance, Scrivener gives: 'B.C. 4004 Hebrew, 5586 (?) Greek'; at 7¹⁰: B.C. 2349 Hebrew, B.C. 3347 (?) Greek'; and so on 8¹⁸; 12¹: 1921, 2040, etc. All other editions which I can

consult give now only, 'B.C. 4004, 2349, 1921.' Has it been considered dangerous to call attention to a fact which earlier times openly acknowledged? I hope the approaching jubilee of the A.V. will give us the history of these dates.

To call attention to the difference in the reckoning of the birth of Abraham seems the more necessary, since Kittel in the new edition of the Herzog-Hauck *Encyclopedia*, xxi. 641, has not a syllable on it, while in the second edition G. Röscher (xvii. 454) had devoted more than a page to this question. I trust the American edition will make good this fault. Truly, Ussher's reckoning, taken over into the A.V., is not such a *quantité négligeable*.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustrations this month have been found by the Rev. David Reid, B.D., St. John's United Free Church, Leith, and the Rev. J. Evans, Pwllheli, North Wales, to each of whom a copy of Downer's *Mission and Ministration of the Holy Spirit* will be sent; and by the Rev. F. W. Boreham, Hobart, Tasmania, to whom a copy of Adams's *Israel's Ideal* will be sent.

Illustrations for the Great Text for October must be received by the 1st of September. The text is Ps 4⁶.

The Great Text for November is Ps 8^{3, 4}:

'When I consider thy heavens, the work of thy fingers,
The moon and the stars, which thou hast ordained;
What is man that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?'

A copy of Leckie's *Authority in Religion*, or Barry's *Ideals and Principles of Church Reform*, along with Anderson's *St. Matthew's Gospel*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for December is Ps 9^{9, 10}:

'The Lord also will be a high tower for the oppressed,
A high tower in times of trouble;

And they that know thy name will put their trust in thee;

For thou, Lord, hast not forsaken them that seek thee.'

A copy of Durell's *Self-Revelation of our Lord*, or two volumes of Plummer's *English Church History*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for January is Ps 11⁸:

'If the foundations be destroyed,
What can the righteous do?'

A copy of Forrest's *Authority of Christ*, or any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for February is Ps 14¹:

'The fool hath said in his heart,
There is no God.'

A copy of any volume of the 'International Theological Library,' or of the 'International Critical Commentary,' will be given for the best illustration.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

GTU Library



3 2400 00276 7790

7

EXPOSITION TIME

14878

SEP 7 1938

MR 7 '58

14878

CBPac

